

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES



ADVISORY BOARD:

Prof. L. Baeck. Prof. M. Buber. Prof. M. Ginsberg. Prof. C. Singer.
Prof. D. Winton Thomas.

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Rabbi A. Altmann, Ph.D. D. Diringer, D.Litt. A. M. Hyamson, O.B.E.
E. Marmorstein, M.A. C. Rabin, D.Phil. S. Stein, Ph.D.

EDITOR:

J. L. TEICHER, M.A., Ph.D.

Vol. V. No. 2

1954

CONTENTS

	Page
J. L. TEICHER	
THE HABAKKUK SCROLL	47
S. M. STERN	
A TWELFTH-CENTURY CIRCLE OF HEBREW POETS IN SICILY—I	60
Ch. W. REINES	
KOHELETH ON WISDOM AND WEALTH	80
NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS	
F. NORMAN: 1. REMARKS ON YIDDISH KUDRUN	85
Ch. W. REINES: 2. KOHELETH VIII, 10	86
J. L. TEICHER AND D. WINTON THOMAS	
CURRENT LITERATURE	88

THE HABAKKUK SCROLL

Among the manuscripts discovered in the Qumrân cave—the cave that was found first and that yielded the most important collection of writings, the Habakkuk Scroll occupies an exceptional position. This Scroll is a commentary in Hebrew on the text of the first two chapters of the prophet Habakkuk—a commentary of a quite peculiar nature. For the commentator is not concerned with explaining the words of the text or with the purport of the prophetic message ; his purpose rather is to show that the pattern and the significance of events that happened within his own generation are contained, as it were, in blueprint, in the utterances, which are quoted in full, of the ancient prophet. The commentary is thus in effect an historical account of a phase in the life of the community to which its author belonged.

Unfortunately, the statements in the account are couched in a language that is tantalisingly cryptic for the modern reader. No dates or proper names are mentioned ; the style is deliberately allusive and symbolic, and the phraseology, although almost entirely derived from the vocabulary of the Hebrew Bible, is to some degree perplexing, owing to the use, or rather misuse, of metaphor. Regarded as an historical source, the Habakkuk Scroll may be said, with some slight exaggeration, to have been written in code.

Can the code be broken ? Can the secret be wrested from the text of the Habakkuk Scroll and the community which produced it identified ? It is my contention that this can be achieved ; and I propose now to offer an interpretation of the Scroll which, I submit, supplies the complete solution of the riddle of its origin.

I shall include in this interpretation all essential passages of the Scroll, and I shall group together, for convenience of exposition, passages which have the same subject-matter, as far as this is feasible. I shall, however, much to my regret, have no time to deal with the problem presented by the attitude of mind of the commentator towards the biblical text, which allows him to transpose the words of the prophet from their ancient, to his own contemporary, key, nor shall I have time to spare to consider the nature of the biblical text used by the commentator. I shall limit myself merely to the expository side of the commentary.

The geographical background of the commentary is Palestine, and the contemporary political horizon is overshadowed by the mighty and warlike nation called by the commentator the Kittium. Who are they ? The detailed description of this warrior nation contains a passage (VI, 3-4) which offers an unmistakable clue to its identity. The Kittium are said to "offer sacrifices to their standards" : *חמה ובחים לאותותם*. This is indeed a striking feature, and scholars have engaged, and are still engaging, in lively discussion about the nationality of the army to which this feature applies. The

discussion circles round two possibilities: that the Kittiim stand for the Hellenistic army or for the Roman republican army. In either case, the chronological background of the Habakkuk Scroll would fall within the pre-Christian period. Both parties in the discussion agree at least on this point—but the discussion itself is, alas, exasperatingly unrealistic.

In fact, there is no evidence whatever that the Hellenistic armies sacrificed to their standards, and indeed there is no evidence that they even possessed military standards. Nor, again, is there any evidence that the Roman republican army sacrificed to their standards. The only evidence there is of an ancient army worshipping their standards refers to the Roman army under the Empire. In the scholarly discussion of this question much has been made of the reference in Cicero to the legionary eagle worshipped by Catiline in his private chapel. This is regarded as an indication that the worship of standards already existed in Rome in the republican period. But, I feel almost embarrassed to say, an eagle is an eagle, not standards; and standards are standards, not an eagle. The silver eagle of the Roman legion was regarded as a deity and was the object of divine cult. Cicero's reference shows only that the worship of the legionary eagle antedates the Empire; but this has no bearing whatever on the worship of standards, which, strictly speaking, were not regarded as deities, either during the Republic or during the Empire.

Classical scholars, who are not unaware of Catiline's eagle, think that the cult of the standards might have been connected with the cult of the Emperors whose images, apparently in the shape of medallions, adorned the shafts of the military standards. An incident reported by Josephus Flavius in both his *Antiquities* and his *Jewish War* confirms that this was so and discloses moreover the date at which the cult of standards was introduced among the units of the Roman army stationed in Palestine. When Pilate was appointed procurator of Judæa by the Emperor Tiberius and took up office in 26 of the Christian Era, he ordered the contingents of the Roman occupation army to take up their winter quarters in Jerusalem, and they entered the City with their military standards adorned with the images of the Emperor. Earlier procurators had, according to Josephus, refrained from doing so out of respect for Jewish laws and feelings. They had introduced to Jerusalem standards without such adornments. Pilate's action aroused great consternation among the Jews. They implored Pilate to remove the standards from the City, and finally by a heroic act of passive resistance impressed the procurator so much that he gave orders "that the standards be forthwith removed from the City." Josephus' account is full of difficulties and obviously biased, but this is not the place to discuss it. It may suffice to say here that it is unlikely that under earlier procurators the Roman cohorts in

Palestine had two sets of standards, one with, and the other without, images of the Emperor. They simply had standards with no effigies, which, of course, gave no offence to the Jews. Pilate must have acted under Tiberius' instructions and extended to the provincial troops the cult of the Emperor's image which had been introduced among the metropolitan units. In any case, it is significant that Pilate removed the obnoxious standards from Jerusalem but did not replace them with others deprived of images. There was obviously no other set of standards available in the army. The result of this rather lengthy but necessary discussion is very important. We have gained a *terminus a quo*. The Habakkuk Scroll was not written before the year 26 of the Christian Era when Pilate was appointed procurator of Judaea.

A grave objection might, however, be raised against the line of argument pursued so far. Why, it may be asked, render the word *'othoth* in the passage of the Scroll as "standards"? The word can just as well mean "signs"—"signa" in Latin; and since the military eagle was a "signum," should not the relevant passage in the Habakkuk Scroll be translated: "They offer sacrifices to their signs," that is, to their eagles, which could refer after all to the Roman republican army? In the scholarly discussion on this point, the words "eagle" and "signum" are in fact employed as synonyms, as terms interchangeable with one another. But I must confess that I have very serious doubts whether the Latin term, "signum" by itself, outside a qualifying context, ever refers to the legionary eagle and the whole discussion seems to me to rest upon an equivocation of the term. However this may be, it is clear at least that the author of the Habakkuk Scroll was not guilty of such an equivocation and that he referred by *'othoth* to standards, not to eagles. For after having said that the Kittium, that is, the Romans sacrifice to their *'othoth*, he goes on to say that "the instruments of their wars are their gods": *וכי מלחמות המה מוראים*. The expression "instruments of their wars" has been variously interpreted as referring to "arms," "war-engines," or "trophies." But surely "trophies" were never regarded as gods, and, heathens as the Romans were, they yet never looked upon their arms or war-engines as deities. Their heathen faith would have been shattered after every battle in which their arms or engines were destroyed. In fact, the expression in the Scroll refers to the most essential and important instrument of war in the Roman army—the legionary eagles. These were truly the deities of the Roman legions. They are called by Tacitus: "propria legionum numina." Another phrase of Tacitus', in which he refers to "signa et (aves) bellorum dei"—the standards and eagles, the deities of war—offers a perfect analogy to the two distinctive features, the standards and the eagles, ascribed in the Habakkuk Scroll to the Roman army. The imperial, not the republican, army.

The rest of the description in the Scroll of the Kittium, the Romans, depicts them as a bloodthirsty nation which used its military might to conquer the world, destroying in the process kingdoms and cities, and which in its insatiable lust for power committed all manner of crimes. Conquest did not bring peace to the subdued nations, who were, on the contrary, squeezed out of existence and ruined by oppressive taxation and tributes (III, 6-15; IV, 1-4; VI, 6-12). What period of Roman history does this description suit?

Professor R. Goossens, the classical scholar of Brussels, has offered an answer to this question (*La Nouvelle Clio*, IV [1952], Nos. 5-8). He maintains that the description fits the last stage of the Roman republican period alone, and that the Habakkuk Scroll could not therefore have been written before 70 or after 40 of the pre-Christian Era. Professor Goossens' arguments in support of his thesis are very simple: The military exploits of the Romans described in the Scroll refer to the great war of Lucullus and Pompey and their conquest of the East. The description in the Scroll of the oppression of the subdued countries has its counterpart in Cicero's prosecution speeches, in which he vigorously denounced the practices and behaviour of the proconsuls in Asia, "those vultures of the provinces." And finally, the hatred of Roman militarism and aggressiveness displayed in the Scroll has its analogy in the letter of Mithridates composed by Sallust and inserted into his "History" about 40 B.C. These parallels to the Habakkuk Scroll in Latin literature of the last period of the Roman Republic show, according to Goossens, that the Scroll must have been written in the same period. Certainly not later, for, to quote his own words: "The description of the Kittium does not suit a period in which the *pax romana* followed upon the era of the great conquests, or a period in which imperial authority clipped the talons of the vultures of the provinces."

Despite their simplicity, I find Professor Goossens' arguments peculiar—indeed, incomprehensible. He must have forgotten that, at least as far as Roman Palestine was concerned, the *pax romana* was shattered by the outbreak of the Jewish War in 66 C.E. He must also have forgotten the rule, or rather misrule, of the procurators in Judaea, whose depredations were the immediate cause of the uprising of the Jews against the Romans. Surely, if any conclusions concerning the date of its composition can be drawn from the anti-Roman sentiments expressed in the Habakkuk Scroll, the eve of the outbreak of the Jewish War, even indeed the first year of hostilities, offers the most likely occasion. No firm conclusion of this kind, however, can be drawn—only a general presumption. For, as a matter of fact, the anti-Roman sentiments in the Habakkuk Scroll have their analogy not only in the Latin literature of the late Roman republican period, to which Professor

Goossens has so unaccountably restricted himself, but also in the writings of Greek, Latin, Jewish, and Christian authors during the whole period of heathen Roman history, both republican and imperial.

Fortunately, the Scroll itself contains two indications which allow us to convert the presumption that it was written at the beginning of, or shortly before, the Jewish War into a certainty. The first is contained in the passage IV, 11-14, which relates that the governors (מושלים) of the Romans, following the instruction of the "House of Idolatry" (בֵּית אַשְׁמָה) come in succession, one after another, to destroy the country. The expression, "House of Idolatry," refers, I submit, to the Imperial Palace, a place of idolatry, since the Emperor was the object of a divine cult, and the passage in the Scroll means accordingly that the procurators of Judaea sent out by the Emperor ruined the country—a concise and apt description of the rule of the Roman procurators in Palestine before the outbreak of the Jewish War.

The second indication is embodied in the passage IX, 4-7. It is more transparent, since the relevant part contains no metaphor. The passage refers to *the last priests in Jerusalem, who have amassed wealth and gain from the booty of Gentiles, but whose wealth will in the end be given over to the Roman soldiers, because the Romans are the only nation that will remain*. We clearly have here a prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman army—a prediction that falls into line with other similar prophecies which circulated in Palestine in the excited atmosphere of preparation for the war with the Romans, and of which chapter XIII of the Gospel of Mark has preserved another example. The "last priests"—"last," in the sense that there will be no more after them—are not priests of the Jewish Temple. There is no reference whatever to Jews in the whole Scroll. The priests here are the ministers or teachers of the Jerusalem Church, who have come to an agreement with Paul and accepted the collections from the Gentile Churches ("the booty of the Gentiles").

The anti-Roman sentiment expressed in the Habakkuk Scroll is most remarkable. It is not hatred, at least not the passion of hatred that moves people to action. It is rather a mixture of horror and contempt, as if the Romans were beyond the pale of humanity, as if they were a malicious natural force against which human action was powerless. There is a characteristic passage in the Scroll (II, 14-15) which defines its author's attitude towards the Romans. It states that the Romans *do not believe in divine laws*: they are thus a people who have no religion. This is perhaps the only new melody in the symphony of anti-Roman motifs contained in the Habakkuk Scroll, all of which belong to the stock-in-trade argument of the secular opposition to Rome. The conception of the Romans as a people with no religion lies at the root of the eschatological

vision of history that is characteristic of the author of the Scroll. The Romans, the seed of Satan, not of man, will have their run in the world as predestined by God, and after having gained full dominion over the world they will be annihilated by divine action and an utterly new phase in the life of the world will be inaugurated. When this event will take place, no man knows, for God in His mysterious wisdom has fixed the duration of all periods in the world's history, which will run their course and spend themselves in accordance with His will. This unshakable belief in the final liberation of the world from the power of evil as represented by all heathendom allows the author of the Scroll to view with equanimity the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. For this will be their ultimate achievement, a visible symbol of their complete domination over the world, and then their end will come on the Day of the Last Judgment, when God will destroy the wicked and all worshippers of idols from the face of the earth (XIII, 1-4).

But it is not God himself who will sit in judgment over mankind on that Last Day. He will delegate His power as judge to His Elect. This is explicitly stated in the passage V, 1-6: "God will hand over to His Elect the judgment of all the heathens (כָּל הָנוּיִם), and at the same time that punishment is inflicted upon them (וּבְתוּכָתָם) the wicked among God's own people, those who have not observed God's commandment in the time of distress will be sentenced" (I have inserted the word "not," which was inadvertently omitted by the copyist of the Scroll). This passage of the Scroll is of fundamental importance; it offers decisive evidence of the nature of the religious community from which the Scroll emanated. For the conception that not God himself, but His Elect, will be the judge of mankind on the Last Day is Christian, and only Christian. It is the Christian Messiah, the Son of God, to whom the divine attributes and powers as the judge of mankind have been delegated. No other messianological system of religion but the Christian admits this.

This passage in the Scroll, with its reference to the two categories of people who will be punished, the heathen and the wicked who have not observed God's commandment, has its exact parallel in II Thess. i, 7ff.:

The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God [that is, the heathen who have no religion], as well as on them that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord.

It is, I think, generally agreed that this passage in Thessalonians represents the teaching of the primitive Church, and it is therefore not surprising that its purport should be identical with that of the passage in the Scroll.

The judge of mankind on the Last Day is thus, according to the Habakkuk Scroll, the Elect, the Christian Messiah, that is, Jesus. Is then Jesus referred to explicitly in the Scroll? He is; under the appellation of *moreh ha-ṣedeq*, which should be correctly translated the "True Teacher"—the title applied to Jesus both in Mark and among the Jewish-Christian sect of the Ebionites. The identification of *moreh ha-ṣedeq* with Jesus is proved beyond any doubt by certain passages of the Habakkuk Scroll itself, independently of the evidence contained in other Dead Sea Scrolls. In column VII of the Scroll, the difference between the prophet Habakkuk and the "True Teacher" (Jesus) is indicated in a very illuminating manner. Habakkuk, it is stated here, was commanded by God to write down the events that would occur during the last generation, that is, during the last period of history before the Final Judgment (את הבאות על הדור האחרון); but God did not reveal to the prophet the *קץ*, the consummation of time, the conclusion of the period of earthly history—that is, what would happen after the course of history on earth had run to its end. To the "True Teacher," however, God had made known all the mysteries contained in the words of His servants, the prophets. This implies clearly that the revelation accorded to the "True Teacher" was superior to that accorded to Habakkuk and indeed all the other prophets, since to the "True Teacher" was granted understanding of the mysteries which the prophets themselves had uttered without understanding them. And this understanding obviously comprised the *קץ*, knowledge of the consummation of time. And what can this be other than knowledge of the "Kingdom of God," the original message as preached by Jesus? The Hebrew prophets prophesied the advent of the Messiah as an earthly king, but not the instauration of the Kingdom of God. Jesus, however, transformed the prophetic message of an earthly messianic kingdom into the conception of the transmundane Kingdom of God, which represented, according to him, the true meaning of the Hebrew prophetic message, the solution of the mystery contained in it. Not only this: the Hebrew prophetic message contained also the conception of the Day of Punishment, the Day of the Lord. This conception, too, was transformed by Jesus into the more specific conception of the Last Judgment, at which the Messiah, the supreme judge of mankind, would sentence to destruction the wicked and the heathen. The *קץ*, the consummation of time, the final eschatological event which would comprise both the Last Judgment and the Kingdom of God, was thus revealed to the "True Teacher" only, not to the prophets. The *moreh ha-ṣedeq*, the "True Teacher," is, then, none other than Jesus.

It was the faith in the "True Teacher," Jesus, that sustained the community to which the author of the Habakkuk Scroll belonged, during the period—in their belief, the last period—of the

dominion of evil in the world, קץ הרשעה. They were convinced that, for the sake of their labour and faith in the "True Teacher," God would save them from the flames of hell (VIII, 1-3: אשר יצילם מבית המשפט בעבור عملם ואמנתם במורה הצדק). The expression *beyth ha-mishpat* means the place of punishment by fire, hell, as is evident from column X, 5. Is there, or has there been, any creed on earth in which guarantee of salvation from the flames of hell is assured to those who believe in a person, except the Christian creed, with the belief in Jesus Christ?

Before we go on to discuss the main theme of the Habakkuk Scroll, mention must be made of the passage II, 5-10, concerning the "Priest," *hakohen*. He is the man to whom God has granted wisdom (this word is conjectural) to explain (לפשור) all the words of His servants, the prophets, regarding the events that will occur during the last generation (את כל[bן]אות על הדור האחרון). The last phrase is exactly the same as that used in the Scroll to describe the contents of the revelation accorded to the prophet Habakkuk: את הבאות על הדור האחרון, and it seems obvious that this "Priest" is none other than the author of our Scroll, to whom wisdom was granted by God to explain the words of the prophet Habakkuk in reference to the events of his own generation. I am glad to say that many scholars share this view. Unfortunately, at the same time, all scholars hold the view that this "Priest" is identical with the *moreh ha-sedeq*, the "True Teacher." According to this view, the Habakkuk Scroll must be an autobiography of the "True Teacher"—which would be an absurdity in the theory of those scholars who rightly maintain that at the time of the composition of the Habukkuk Scroll the "True Teacher" was no longer alive; while in the case of those scholars who wrongly maintain that the "True Teacher" was still alive, it would be impossible to explain why the author of an autobiography should have chosen to refer to himself at one time as "Priest" and at another time as the "True Teacher." In fact, the "Priest" is not identical with the "True Teacher"; his status is inferior to that of the prophets, not superior, as is the status of the "True Teacher," and he has received no prophetic revelation from God, but only wisdom to explain the words of the prophets.

What is, then, the exact connotation of the word "priest" in the Habakkuk Scroll? Here again all scholars hold the view that the "priest" is a minister of a cult connected with sacrifices. But there is not the slightest reference in any of the Scrolls to the sacrifice of animals, and to postulate a sacrificial cult among the sect of the Scrolls is manifestly absurd in view of the fact that the sect was vegetarian and abhorred the shedding of blood. The "priest" in the Habakkuk Scroll is, as his function of interpreter declares, a teacher, a minister, a religious leader, or briefly, since we are dealing with a Christian writing of the first century, an apostle in

the widest connotation of this term. I should like to add that there are rabbinical passages in which the expression "priest" cannot refer to a priest connected with a sacrificial cult.

We are now prepared to explain the main theme of the Habakkuk Scroll: the career of the person named the "Wicked Priest," *kohen ha-resha'*, or *ha-rasha'*. The most significant passage in the Scroll regarding the "Wicked Priest" (XI, 4-8), reads as follows:

The Impious Priest who had persecuted the True Teacher in his place of exile in order to destroy him in burning wrath, appeared to them at the time of the solemn feast, the Day of Atonement and Rest, in order to destroy them by inducing them to sin on that Day of Fasting, the Day of their sabbatical rest.

Who is the "Impious Priest"? Is he a Jewish High Priest, as is universally maintained? There is no mention, however, in the text, either here or anywhere else, that the "Impious Priest" was a High Priest. On the other hand, if we understand, as we must understand, the expression, the "True Teacher," in this passage as referring to Jesus, we are compelled to take the expression, the "Impious Priest," as referring to Paul. The passage of the Scroll now gives a perfect meaning. It states, in its first part, that Paul persecuted Jesus in his place of exile in order to destroy him. This obviously refers to Paul's or rather Saul's persecution (or intended persecution) of the Christian community in Damascus, their place of exile from Jerusalem. In the account in the Acts of this persecution (XXVI, 14), Jesus appeared to Paul and said to him in the Hebrew tongue: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" The same expression, פָּגַת, "persecuted," is used in the Scroll, and, more significantly, the term, "True Teacher"—that is, Jesus—is employed in the Scroll as a symbol for the Christian community or church exactly as in the Acts. This explains the sudden transition to the plural form in the second part of the passage under discussion in which it is stated that Paul appeared before them—that is, the Christian community, presumably in Jerusalem—on the Day of Atonement in order to induce them to sin. What does this refer to? Let us recall the *leitmotif* of the "Epistle to the Hebrews." This is, briefly, the assertion that the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross superseded the Jewish expiatory rite of the Day of Atonement in the Temple of Jerusalem, or, in other words, that the Christians no longer needed to observe the *yom hakipurim* in order to be redeemed from sin. Now, this is exactly the purport of the passage of the Scroll which states that Paul appeared before the Church in Jerusalem on the Day of Atonement in order to induce them to sin, that is to say, that Paul attempted to persuade the members of the Jerusalem Church to free themselves from the Jewish rite. The general purport of the passage in the Scroll is thus in conformity with Paul's known attitude towards the Jewish laws.

But there is a difficulty here, and a very serious one. It is, that we have no independent information that Paul visited Jerusalem in order to persuade the members of the Church to abandon the Jewish laws and adhere to his interpretation of the Gospel. Indeed, the account in the Acts of Paul's third and last visit to Jerusalem—and this is the only occasion on which Paul might have preached to the Jerusalem Church on the subject of rejecting the Jewish laws—flatly contradicts the interpretation of the passage of the Scroll which I have just offered. Must then this interpretation be abandoned? Or is it possible that the Habakkuk Scroll is a reliable historical source, and the information it offers about Paul's sermon in Jerusalem true?

Let us now examine other passages of the Scroll relating to the "Impious Priest." In column XII, 6-9, we read that the "Impious Priest" committed abominable deeds and polluted the Temple of God in Jerusalem. This information is fully borne out by the account in the Acts xxi, 28, according to which Paul was accused of having brought Greeks who were uncircumcised into the Temple and of having "polluted this holy place."

Another passage in the Scroll (VIII, 3ff.) states that "the Impious Priest was called by the True Name at the beginning of his ministry, but when he became ruler in Israel he abandoned God in his presumption and betrayed the laws for the sake of wealth." The phrase "called by the True Name," a literal translation of the Hebrew: נִקְרָא עַל שְׁם הָאָמֵת is difficult. I submit that it corresponds to the Greek *epikalomenous to onoma touto* in the Acts ix, 21, which refers to the followers of Jesus. The meaning of the whole passage in the Scroll is then that the "Impious Priest" at the beginning of his ministry was a true follower of Jesus but afterwards, when his influence in the Church (Israel) had grown, he rebelled against the laws of God for the sake of wealth. Applied to Paul, the passage indicates that there were two stages in his career as an apostle: the first, in which he preached the doctrine of the Jerusalem Church, and the second, in which he broke away from it and organised the Gentile Church on a different basis, involving the abolition of the Jewish laws—God's laws, in the eyes of the author of the Scroll. The reference to "wealth" in connection with Paul relates to his financial organisation of the Gentile churches—the "wealth" of the Gentiles was impure and tainted money in the eyes of our author.

The two stages of Paul's career are not referred to at all in the Acts. But they are confirmed by Paul's own words in Galat. i, 22-24: here he states: "I was unknown by face unto the churches of Judaea which were in Christ. They had heard only that he who persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed. And they glorified God in me." The Palestinian Church obviously believed, whether rightly or wrongly, that Paul in the

beginning of his apostolate conformed with their teaching and, as a matter of fact, other passages of the "Epistle to the Galatians," when read in the light of the "Discipline Scroll," clearly indicate that Paul did at first propagate the teaching of the Jerusalem Church.

I will quote now a passage in the Scroll (V, 8-11), which at first sight is very obscure indeed. In this passage, the author refers the words of Habakkuk i, 13, to the *House of Absalom and their supporters who kept silent at the rebuke administered to the True Teacher and did not succour him against the Man of Falsity.* (וְתַחֲרִישׁ בְּבָלָע רְשָׁע צְדִיק מִמְּנוּ פָּשְׁרוּ עַל בֵּית אֲבְשָׁלוֹם וְאֶנְשָׁי עַצְם אֲשֶׁר נִדְמוּ בְּתוּבָת מֹרֶה הַצְדִּיק וְלֹא עֹזְרוּוּ עַל אִישׁ הַכּוֹבֵד.)

What does the "House of Absalom" mean in this context? This at least seems to be clear: the expression, "House of Absalom," was suggested to the author of the Scroll by the verb *taharish* in the text of the prophet Habakkuk, which is translated in the Revised Version as "Holdest thy tongue." For the same verb occurs also in the story of Absalom (II Samuel xiii, 20), who, when he heard about the outrage to his sister Tamar, said: "Now my sister, hold thy peace" (*haharishi*). Absalom thus connived, although only temporarily, at an iniquity. I suggest that the author of the Scroll used the term, the "House of Absalom," as a symbol for those who connive at, and do not oppose, injustice. Indeed, the best translation of this expression in modern idiom would be "apeasers."

I further suggest that the term, the "True Teacher," in this passage, as in the previous one concerning the persecution in Damascus, refers not to the person of Jesus but to the Church, and that the term, "Man of Falsity," is a variant of the term, the "Impious Priest," and stands for Paul.

Armed with these suggestions we can perceive now that the author of the Scroll referred in this passage to a group of men and their supporters who connived at the outrage to the Church by keeping silent and who did not help the church against Paul. To what episode in the history of the relations between Paul and the Jerusalem Church does this passage refer? Here again, the "Epistle to the Galatians" in chapter two supplies us with the answer. Paul relates here that when he came to Jerusalem for the conference with the leaders of the Jerusalem Church in order to settle their differences, he expounded before them the gospel that he was preaching, and they added nothing to it (*ouden prosanethento*), which means; to use a more forceful expression, "they kept their mouths shut." Then, after having listened to Paul's exposition, the pillars of the church, James, Cephas, and John, gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of friendship, apparently still without saying a word. Their silent acceptance of Paul's proposals appeared to the radical opponents of Paul an act of "appeasement," or connivance at an iniquity, like that of Absalom.

Paul had hoped that he would be able to confer with the leaders of the church in Jerusalem in private, but his hope was frustrated, for "false brethren," his opponents, were brought in. It is conceivable that one of these false brethren was the author of the Habakkuk Scroll, who witnessed the silent submission of the leaders to Paul. The expression "false brethren" used by Paul in reference to his opponents, is worthy of note. It is the same expression that the author of the Scroll, Paul's opponent, uses when he calls Paul the "Man of Falsity."

There is no mention in the Acts of this encounter between Paul and the leaders of the church, but, as we have seen, Paul's own words in Galatians confirm the reference to it in the passage of the Habakkuk Scroll. The credibility of the Scroll as an historical source must be esteemed very high indeed, and I have no hesitation in submitting that its reference to Paul's attempt to convert the Jerusalem Church to his own views on the Day of Atonement should be accepted as true.

At the conference in Jerusalem, Paul agreed that collections from the Gentile churches should go to the Jerusalem Church. A passage in the Habakkuk Scroll (XII, 9-10), referring to the "Impious Priest"—that is, Paul—as having robbed the wealth of the "Poor" (אֲבִיּוֹנִים), is certainly connected with these collections. Unfortunately, the whole matter of collections is very obscure, owing to the lack of precise information. But it can be easily understood that the radical Hebrew Christians, the opponents of Paul, would regard themselves as "robbed" when they had to deprive themselves of collections from the Gentile churches which had passed over to Paul (the money would be tainted in their eyes). The chequered career of the Galatian Church, first converted by Paul, then captured by the emissaries of the Jerusalem Church, and finally recaptured by Paul, is an illustration of the kind of situation that arose in the first century of the Christian mission.

The application of the expression, "robbed," to Paul in this passage as well as in VIII, 12, may appear extraordinary. But it is exactly the expression that appears to have been used against Paul by his adversaries on the evidence of Paul's own words in II Corinthians xi, 8: "I robbed other churches, taking wages of them to do you service." Paul is here obviously picking up the accusation launched against him and throwing it back into the teeth of his opponents. It is also useful to remember that Paul reorganised the collections from the churches and brought them under his control (I Corinthians xvi, 1-4), and this may have indirectly turned into a disadvantage for the radicals of the Jerusalem Church.

The term 'ebhyonim, "the Poor," used in the passage I have just referred to, as well as in other passages of the Scroll, is beyond any doubt a technical term designating the community of the author of the Scroll. It is the same term which, in its Greek equivalent,

ptochoi, is used in the N.T. to designate the members of the Jerusalem Church. It is not yet—an important point to remember—the name of the Jewish-Christian sect, the Ebionites. At the time when the Habakkuk Scroll was composed, shortly before the outbreak, or in the first year, of the Jewish War, that is, in 65 or 66 C.E., there were as yet no sects in Christianity. In the Habakkuk Scroll, the term *'ebhyonim* refers to the members of the Jerusalem, or Judæan, Church.

I shall omit reference to a few passages of the Scroll which relate to Paul and the Gentile churches, since their interpretation offers no difficulties, and they add nothing to what we already know. I shall go on to examine the important passage, ix, 8-12, where it is stated here that the "Impious Priest" was handed over to his enemies to be tortured to death in anguish *לענותו בגע לכלה* (במרור נפש).

This can only refer to Paul's martyrdom, which, according to tradition, took place in Rome about 64 C.E. The Habakkuk Scroll itself was written, as I have already suggested, in 65 or 66, that is, not very long after the news of Paul's death had reached Palestine. I hope I do not err greatly in suggesting that it was the news of Paul's death that prompted the author of the Habakkuk Scroll to write his commentary. For it is significant that the career of Paul, under the name of the "Impious Priest," forms the main theme of the Habakkuk Scroll. The Scroll itself may have been written in Jerusalem or more likely in Qumrân. There are certain reasons in favour of the latter view but I cannot deal with them here.

To sum up: The Habakkuk Scroll is a document of the primitive Church, written in 65 or 66, probably in Qumrân, by a radical opponent of Paul. The career of Paul and his conflict with the Jerusalem Church are its main theme and are the key to the interpretation of its obscure passages. The Habakkuk Scroll is an original source of inestimable value for our knowledge of the career of Paul and the history of the church in the first century.

The theory of the Christian origin of the Dead Sea Scrolls has, I submit, passed its test of validity. The interpretation of the Habakkuk Scroll which I have just offered has demonstrated its fitness and suitability. There is no need for me to mention that the archæological, numismatic, and paleographical evidence supplied by the excavations of the caves near the Dead Sea—as long as this evidence is examined without bias or prejudice—as well as the evidence of the contents of the other Scrolls and the Damascus Fragments, offer full corroboration of this theory. All the available evidence points to the same conclusion: the Dead Sea Scrolls are Christian documents.

J. L. TEICHER.

Cambridge.

A TWELFTH-CENTURY CIRCLE OF HEBREW POETS IN SICILY—I

ANATOLI BEN YOSEF THE JUDGE AND HIS FRIENDS

The rise of Spanish-Hebrew poetry in the tenth century forms a real water-shed in the history of medieval Hebrew literature, and it can, without any doubt, be described as the most significant event of this history. It meant nothing less than the introduction into the orbit of Hebrew literature of subjects never treated in it before, as well as of utterly novel canons of Hebrew style. Hispano-Hebraic poetry served as the means of expression of a refined society grouped round aristocrats who acted as its patrons. Its language was ruled by strict classicism.¹ It is easy to realise that the full life of this poetry could last only so long as the special social conditions lasted which had called it into being. The twelfth century saw the end of that astonishing and beautiful epoch: with the decline of the society sustaining it, the poetry, too, was doomed. This does not mean, however, that Spanish Hebrew poetry disappeared entirely from the scene as though it had never been. On the contrary, it left a deep mark upon the whole subsequent history of Hebrew poetry. Not only was the whole later poetry of the Jews in Spain a continuation in a sense of the "golden epoch," but, wherever Jews tried to write poetry in Hebrew, they could not fail to regard that epoch as the shining example to follow. The conditions of their life might differ very much from those of the Jews of Spain in the eleventh century, but they nevertheless found in the poetry of those times a model for the poetical expression of *their* social life. Above all, the highly stilted classicising and conventional language of the Spanish masters always remained a standard for subsequent generations, for any kind of poetry they might choose to cultivate. The poetical schools of Southern France, Italy, and the East, dependencies of Hispano-Hebraic poetry, are sufficiently known. The present study proposes to add to them a new province: a poetical circle in Sicily.

In the middle of the eleventh century the Arabs lost Sicily to the victorious Normans led by Robert and Roger de Hauteville. Yet Moslem civilisation had struck such deep roots in the island, despite the comparatively short time for which the Saracens had

¹ The best description of Hispano-Hebraic poetry is the essay of J. G. WEISS: *הרבנות החרנית ושירה חזנית* (יירוטם להבנת שירת ספרה העברית) printed as a pamphlet, Jerusalem, 1947; reprinted, with insignificant changes, in the *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies* (הכנסם העולמי למדעי היהדות), Jerusalem, 1952, I, 396-402.

had complete possession of Sicily, that not less than two centuries were to elapse before it was definitely effaced. The Norman princes protected all the races, creeds, and tongues of the island. The languages of the inscriptions and documents are Greek, Arabic, and Latin. The French-speaking kings usually understood Greek and Arabic in addition to Latin, and in the brilliant court of Roger II Arabic science and literature flourished. We may recall the great geographer al-Idrisi, who called his important compilation "The Book of Roger" after his Christian master.² We know the names of a considerable number of Arabic poets who lived in Sicily under the rule of the Normans and specimens of their poetry are preserved.³ Even fragments of *qasidas* in praise of the Norman kings, composed by poets like Abu'l-daw Sarraj b. Ahmad, Abd al-Rahman of Butera, Abu Hafs 'Umar b. al-Hasan, Ibn Bashrūn, and 'Abd al-Rahman b. Ramadan, have come down to us.⁴ It almost appears as if kadi had a special *penchant* towards poetry: one of them, 'Abd al-'Aziz b. al-Husayn, was even nicknamed the "Boon Companion Judge" (*al-qadi al-jalis*), while the Egyptian kadi and poet Ibn Qalāqis, another Moslem colleague of Anatoli ben Yosef the Judge visited Sicily at about the same time as the latter (in the year 1168) and composed many poems during his stay in the island.⁵

We know very little about the Jews of Sicily at this period⁶ but we may safely assume that their language and education were Arabic. The few individuals mentioned in the documents bear, with the exception of those called by Hebrew names, Arabic ones.⁷ The same is true of the persons appearing in the literary document that will be treated below. Late in the thirteenth century a wandering Spanish scholar wrote: "But, indeed, most remarkable is what happened to the Jews in all Sicily, who not only speak Italian or Greek, these being the languages of those among whom they dwell, but have preserved the Arabic tongue which they had learned in former times, when the Ishmaelites were dwelling there."⁸ This is, of course, the background and the explanation of the activity of Sicilian Jewish scholars who, in the thirteenth century, translated scientific books of the Arabs into Latin.⁹ Some Moorish customs

² For a description of Arabic civilisation under the Normans, see M. AMARI, *Storia dei musulmani di Sicilia*, 2nd ed., published by C. A. NALLINO, III, 673-922.

³ See AMARI, *op. cit.*, pp. 760-791.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 774-775; 777-780; 781-783; 784, respectively.

⁵ See AMARI, pp. 788-790 and 790, respectively.

⁶ R. STRAUS drew a general picture of the juridical and economical status of the Jews in the Norman (and Staufian) epoch: *Die Juden im Königreich Sizilien unter Normannen und Staufen*, Heidelberg, 1910. He himself, however, complains of the almost total lack of detail. See also C. ROTH, *The History of the Jews of Italy*, pp. 81-83. Between 1170 and 1173 Benjamin of Tudela passed through Sicily and visited the communities of Messina and Palermo.

⁷ See STRAUS, p. 99.

⁸ ROTH, p. 82 (A. Abulafia).

⁹ See, for example, U. MONNERET DE VILLARD, *Lo Studio dell'Islam in Europa nel XII e nel XIII secolo*, Vatican City, 1944, pp. 28-29, and the bibliography quoted.

were observed among the Jews of Sicily as late as the fifteenth century. Nevertheless, there is no need to suppose that in writing their poetry the Jewish poets of Sicily took the models for their poetical compositions from contemporary Sicilian Arabic literature or from Arabic literature in general. The recurrence in their compositions of the canonical Hebrew poetical terminology that had been coined by the Spanish poets leaves no doubt as to the source of their inspiration. They did not take up independently Arabic models, but imitated Hispano-Hebraic poetry. It is, of course, not impossible that these Hebrew *litterati* of Sicily might have been acquainted with Arabic literature—it is even probable that they were. Their writings, however, bear no traces of a direct influence of Arabic poetry.

* * *

The new information concerning the Hebrew poets of Sicily is supplied by the Diwan of Anatoli ben Yosef, the *dayyan* of Alexandria, who is already known to us as a correspondent of Maimonides. An exchange of complimentary epistles and several "Responsa" addressed to him by Maimonides are included in the collections of the Letters and Responsa of Maimonides.¹⁰ Other data about him have been brought to light by J. Mann, who has also listed several liturgical poems written by him.¹¹

The first intimation about the fragments of the Diwan of Anatoli b. Yosef belonging to the Second Firkowicz Collection of the Leningrad Public Library was also given by J. Mann,¹² who has, however, confined himself to the most summary description of the manuscripts and, moreover, assumed erroneously that the poems were composed by Anatoli in Egypt. This had led him to mistaken conclusions and hindered a true appreciation of the texts.¹³

The extant fragments of the Diwan come from three different manuscripts¹⁴:

(A) II. Firkowicz Coll. 72.³ The fragment, consisting of fourteen

¹⁰ For the epistles, part of which is also preserved in a fragment of the Diwan (MS. C, fol. 1v), see יארוחי השוויה ררכ"ס קגץ, Leipzig, 1859, II, 36ff. The *Responsa* can now be read in the new complete edition by A. H. FREIMANN, *דשנות רמב"ם*, Jerusalem, 1935, see Index s.v. Anatoli.

¹¹ *The Jews of Egypt and Palestine under the Fatimids*, 1921, I, 247-248; II, 324-326; *Hebrew Union College Annual*, III (1926), 298.

¹² *Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature*, 1931, I, 412-415. S. ASAFAF, in his review of MANN's book, *Tarbiz*, III (1932), p. 346, drew attention to MS. Firkowicz 104² which had escaped MANN's notice.

¹³ MANN (who in all probability had no leisure for a thorough examination of the manuscripts) has been chiefly misled by the assumption that the persons mentioned in the Diwan were resident in Egypt; thus he took *al-madina*, "the city," i.e., Palermo, to mean Alexandria, etc.

¹⁴ Thanks to the courtesy of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry (affiliated to the Schocken Library, Jerusalem), I have been able to use the photocopies preserved in their archives.

leaves, comprises a portion of six continuous leaves and another portion of eight continuous leaves (a complete quire).

(B) II. Firkowicz Coll. 104², thirteen leaves. Another six leaves originally belonging to this manuscript (B) have been misplaced and now form the conclusion of MS. II. Firk. 72¹ (see next paragraph). Foll. 1-8 form a complete quire; foll. 9-10 must be completed with two pages from MS. 72¹ and arranged as follows: fol. 9, 72¹ foll. 26-27, fol. 10. Fol. 11 is a loose leaf, foll. 12-13 are continuous. Another four leaves from a quire of MS. B are now contained in MS. 72¹ and must be arranged as follows: 24, one or two missing leaves, 28, 29, 25.

(C) II. Firkowicz Coll. 72¹. Mostly loose leaves; 3-2 [*sic!*], 9-10, 12-13, 16-17 are, however, continuous. Foll. 20-23 do not belong to the Diwan of Anatoli, but contain some letters by Yehuda Halevi.¹⁵ Foll. 24-29 belong, as it has already been said, to MS. B.¹⁶

Anatoli's Diwan was collected—it would seem from the evidence of the eulogy for the dead accompanying his name in the headings—after his death, perhaps by a pupil. The editor most probably used papers left behind by Anatoli.

I may, perhaps, find it possible in the future to publish all the remnants of this Diwan, which, without being of first-rate literary value, is by no means without historical interest. For the time being I propose, in the present study, to extract the most salient facts to be learned from the fragments of the Diwan and to publish choice texts of a number sufficient to give a satisfactory idea of the contents and the style of the poems.

The Diwan enables us in the first place to establish Anatoli's town of origin. It has usually been assumed, on the ground of a passage in the chronicle of Sambari,¹⁷ that Anatoli came from Lunel, in the Languedoc; but here, as in many other cases, Sambari proves to be misleading. The Diwan contains a poem (MS. A fol. 1) the first letters of which form an acrostic. The opening lines are missing; the first words of the remaining lines read as follows: ואשפכה, סתרין, פרים, עניין, מת, שפל, ישלה, מזוז, על, ישכיל, ראש... רבה, ושדי, ישר, לבן, יחיד, אתה, חוק, ואמצז. The lacunæ of the acrostic can easily be supplied and the whole of it restituted as follows: “[אָנָטּוֹלִי בֶּן יְזֹהֶף עַמְשִׁי מַעֲרָךְ [מַרְשִׁילְיָה] חֹן, וְאַמְצָז][1] Anatoli the son of Rabbi Y]osef, may he rest in his grave, from the city of [Ma]rsilia. Be strong and of good courage!” Anatoli was, then, a

¹⁵ Published in *Studies of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry*, VI, (1945), 317ff.

¹⁶ MANN mentions another fragment of two leaves containing epistles by Anatoli (II Firkowicz Coll. 105¹). Of this MS. I have no copy at my disposal and am therefore unable to say whether it belongs to one of the MSS. enumerated above or is a fragment of a fourth MS.

¹⁷ NEUBAUER, *Medieval Jewish Chronicles*, I, 133: הַכְּמִי לְוִילִי רְיָ אַנְטּוֹלִי דְּזַי יְסֻף עַמְשִׁי וּרְבִי אַפְּרִים הַלְּמִידָן. It has already been remarked by MANN (*Jews in Fat. Egypt*, II, 325, note 7) that the proper reading is רְיָ אַנְטּוֹלִי בֶּן יְסֻף עַמְשִׁי. Anatoli, indeed, regularly signs his letters contained in the Diwan in this fashion.

native of Marseilles. We also learn from the *Diwan* that the poet called himself, and was called by others, Anatoli and Zerahyah. The former, his more generally used name, derives from Greek and is a shorter form of the name Anatolius, and the Hebrew name is its translation.¹⁸

The date of Anatoli's birth cannot be established with any exactitude, but as he is mentioned as being still alive in a document dated from 1212¹⁹ we may assume that he was born about 1150. No information is available about his early life, nor can we do more than guess the date when he left his native country to seek his fortune elsewhere.

Jewish wandering scholars from Europe were not uncommon in the East in this epoch. They were usually highly esteemed there for their scholarship. Anatoli, too, intended in all probability, when setting out on his travels, to reach Egypt: he took the obvious way through Sicily. We may not be far off the mark in fixing his journey at some time between 1170 and 1180. It was not the custom of the wandering scholar of those days to pass swiftly in transit through the countries on his way. He gladly accepted and enjoyed the hospitality of the notables of those towns through which his journey led him. The well-to-do considered it a point of honour to entertain the scholar passing through their town, and, for his part, the traveller from distant lands was usually a conveyer of the latest novelties from the realm of scholarship and literature and became very often a source of inspiration to the community.

It appears from the *Diwan* that no poem contained in it was written by Anatoli before his arrival in Sicily. Coming from Provence, Anatoli apparently took up his abode first in Palermo, the capital of the island. One of the first friends he acquired in the city was a certain Elyaqim, himself a poet, whom Anatoli visited during the latter's illness. Elyaqim was apparently very much gratified with Anatoli's visit and he expressed his gratitude in poetic hyperboles: "When you visited the invalid stretched out in pain on his bed his soul revived." Anatoli replied with a nice compliment, referring to Elyaqim's verses and probably alluding to his own separation from his home: "There is balsam in your mouth,

¹⁸ It has already been noted by ZUNZ (*Litteraturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie*, p. 466) that the name Anatoli is often accompanied by Zerahyah; cf. also GROSS, *Gallia Judaica*, pp. 371, 375. The form Anatoli is no doubt derived from Anatolius (from *anatole*=sunrise). Zerahyah (God shines) is, of course, similar in meaning to Anatoli. It is hardly probable that the Jews of Europe knew the original meaning of the name Anatoli; its Hebrew counterpart "Zerahyah" is, in all probability, traditional, going back to a country and an epoch when Jews spoke Greek. The name Anatoli, as well as the other Greek names popular in Southern France—Qalonimus=Kalonimos, Todros=Theodoros—might have been introduced by early immigrants from Southern Italy. The name Anatoli occurs in a tombstone from Tarentum, No. 639. (See J. B. FREY, *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum*.) MANN is entirely mistaken when he thinks (*Jews in Fat. Egypt*, I, 247) that "the name (of Anatoli) suggests (as his place of origin) Anatolia in Byzantium."

¹⁹ See MANN, *Jews of Fat. Egypt*, II, 324.

remedy against distress and joy for suffering hearts, speaking noble words in your poetical parables, cast in a mould of charm and perfection. Parables, hewn from the rock of intelligence and [excavated] from the mine of understanding [and wisdom].” Another exchange of courtesies between Anatoli and Elyaqim has come down in a very fragmentary form (MS. B, Firk. 72¹, 25).

MS. B, Firk. 72¹, 24

מما בעת אל חכם ר' אליקים אל ר' אנטולי ענד מגיה אל פלירנו
הדה אל אביהת²⁰

ובשחק מ[כונן] עש וכיימה
לبن-אדם וחציר לבהמה
ולגרים וכל נפש עגומה
טחה לسور אווי מדת קדומה
ומר נפש ולב מרוב מהומה
ולא כהן אשר אוכל תרומה
עלי ערשו וחיתה הנשמה
ברכות אל יסובך בחומה
וימים תאריך על האדמה
תהלה לך ומשברתך שלמה
אשר יסד ארצוות על בלימה.

אשר יסד ארצוות על בלימה
לפתח ולקשרו מעדנים
והוא גומל חסדים למורדים
דרךו אחותה רגלא ולא נ-
בבקרך מזכה מחלאיו
חדל אישים ולא שר על חמשים
ובקרתו בשכבו מכאבו
תמור בדור ב[*בית חולה מדכה]
בכל מקום אשר תדרוך ותפנה
הכי עקב ענוה גם ונואה
תהי מלא לך בוחן כליזות

פראגעה ר' אנטולי זיל²²

בחכמתו והם כראי חזקים
חחלהו ושולח ברקים
ויפדה נפשך מכל מצוקים
ישלם אל דברו לך ויקים
וגם משוש לבבות העשוקים
בכבר חן ויושר הם יזוקים
ומבור בין²³ [וחכמה הם חזוקים].

אשר מתח כמו אהל שחקים
ושם ענן לבושו וערפל
יהי בצר לך מבצר ומגדל
ויתן שאלתך כי כשםך
בפיך יש צרי מרפא למכאוב
בדברך במשלי שיר נגידות
משלים מן יסוד שכל חזובים

There is no indication in the extant fragments of Anatoli's *Diwan* how long he stayed in Palermo (or in Sicily generally). There is, however, every reason to assume that his residence in that town was not very short: it certainly lasted for a month and perhaps even longer. He contracted there many friendships. On the occasion of the voyage of two of his friends, Isaac and Ezechiel, to Messina,

20 “These verses are among those which were sent by the learned Rabbi Elyaqim to Rabbi Anatoli when he came to Palermo” עירנו is a mistake, or another orthography, for עירום.

21 The copyists often left blank spaces for words which they were unable to make out in the prototype they were copying; such passages are marked here by an asterisk. (The reconstruction of such passages, as well as of passages damaged in the actual manuscripts, is, of course, often only an approximation.)

22 “R. Anatoli of blessed memory answered.”

23 The page ends here; the conclusion of the poem is missing.

Anatoli wrote two poems. The first is an elaborate *qasida* that does not fall short in its weighty language and richly ornamented style of the best standards of the Spanish poets. It does not omit even the deserted traces (הַק סְׂדּוֹת) of the friends' abodes for the poet to weep in! "On the day when my friends rode the mounts of leave-taking, my eyes drew tears from the sea of separation. All streams of love became dry, but the rivers of tears were not destroyed. All my joys left me in their pursuit, leaving behind in my heart heaps of distress. During the day, my bitter thoughts lie heavily on my soul, and in the night my gnawing pains do not sleep. When I pass the traces of foundations laid bare and the fallen abodes of the gazelles (=friends), I say: Woe for the foundations plastered with friendship and the structures raised with love." There follows the usual depreciation of cruel "Time," cause of all sorrows, responsible for the separation of friends. The poem ends with a long panegyric and with vows of eternal friendship. The second poem is a *muwashshah* imitating in its versification a poem by Yehuda Halevi. The contents are very much the same as in the first poem. "On the day my friends harnessed the mounts of separation, to go to Messina, the Days (=Time, Fate) rose against me like an enemy setting up snares for my steps, they almost shot at me with stones and the arrows of separation. My soul has no consolation until I meet them again or see them in the apparition of a dream . . ." and so on.

MS. A, fol. 2v-5v

ולה אליו בעז אכוונה אפתחקוֹא מנה²⁴

יום אוחבים פרדר[ן] פרידה רכבו
 בו הרבה כל נחליה האהבה
 כל שעשו עלי אחרים רדפו
 יום מרי שיחי מאד יכבד עלי
 כי עבר על חוק יסודות נהרטו
 הה על יסודותם באhab רצפו
 מה לזמן יצבא צבאו יצפנו
 ימי ושייא גלו לנגדי יסערו
 אל יפתח מתי שייל יקרו דעתכם
 מה תעשו ליום ויכלה חפצכם
 וביום יכל חוסן יקרכט תבעטו
 עליו שاري וחמי ועלי
 אקרא בלב[ב] דכא הלא תרפו מעת
 אין בם לבד נפתל ועקש באשר
 אטמול השבטים אוחבים רק יום נדוד
 לא ילדו ימים לבד הבל וריך
 אם יכרתו עם [*איש ברית] פטע יפי

מים נדוד עני דמעות שאבו
 גם כל יאורי הבכי לאחרבו
 [*אכן] המון צוקים בלבי עזבו
 נשפי ולילת עזוקי לא ישכבו
 ונאות מגורי הצבאים חרכו
 וועלן מכוניהם בחשך עזבו
 רשות אליו רגלי לדמי ארכבו
 וינהמו עלי ואותי סבבו
 הוני שחדרו לבכם אל ייטבו
 יחד אדררי (הברושים ירכבו
 יחד בעיניכם ואז עצבו
 ימים תלונתי לרביב נצבו
 אם ילמדו לך ומוסר יקשיבו
 נטו לרע עלי מזומות חשבו
 גדל כאב לבי ועוני דאבו
 עד ישלו באש לבבותיכאנו
 רוחו ועל בעלי בריתם יעגנו

²⁴ "A poem by him to friends of his who have left him."

וידברו שקר ושווא ויכובו
צבאות יגונוטי לנגידו ישבו
לשופך דמי לבני וואשי חיבנו
אומר להכניעם והמה שגבנו
רווע זמן עלי מרורות כתבו
לבני בעת לכתם ואותי לבבו
או יעשו עמי כפי שנדברו
פתחות באש נודם קרבן יצרבו
נ Hebrew לגעין הפרידה קרבנו
היה בפי כדבר ורוש התערבו
אוו ואל צלמים להביט תאבו
שזהמו לחם ואכל תעבו
יופי ורוחי חן על פניהם נשבו
שלג מאד זכו וספר חצבו
האור וכוסות מכובדים גנבו
ואשר בלחם לחמו לא רעבו
אחר יבשתם חיש לרגלים רטבו
מרפא לכל עצם וללב ערבו
חשקם אשר המה ידים ערבו
ימים ונוגדים מפניהם ערבו
רוח לפגרי התעודה שובבו
מים וקצב לתבונה קצבו
הבחורים צדק וחסד אהבו
לهم לבך יאטה (...) אם ירחהו
אותם באטון אהבתם חטבו
ומקום נחרים שם יארים רחבו
תברה ווים פרוד לבבי נקבו
לי חטא ואותי אורי יום יקבו
לאוהבים בשמות שררה נקבו
נפל (?) וענינו מי דמעות זורבו
עצמו מאד חרה ופנינו צחבו
יום אהבים פרדי פרידה רכבו

חלק לשון תרמה [ביבים] נמצאה
יתמלאו עלי גודדי הנודוד
ויחנו נכחיכי כאילו (נשבעו)
אומר להשפיקם והמה יגבהו
אין על עפרים חטא ואשמה אצבעות
לו ידעו יום נסעו כי שסעו
או יעצרו רכbum עדי לא יסחרו
גהה ומרפא אין וללא אוכרים
עונג תשוקת הידדים רחקו
זכר תשוקתם וזכר הנודוד
חוליל לבבות או רפניהם לחווות
עד יחלמו בהם ויחיו אחריו
על לחים הבר יציצון שבלי
אר מפנינים אדמו עצם ומד
שפתי גביעים מפניהם אצלו
עם מעינותם שאבו לא צמאו
גועי שתלי האתבים זקנו
תטר שפתם צוף ומלייהם דבש
מהם אבקש אחלי לבעליהם מאור
איך יערב לי בלווד לחים מאר
הם החיו דת אל בשכלם גועה
הם מצאו מוצא לחכמה רחבה
השונאים בצע וועל מאסו
נתנו שכם משרה עלי שכם לאות
לאוהבים ערסי ידידות פרסו
על מי מנוחות נהלו אותי לאט
אונני עליהם רצעו יום בחרו
אם אשאללה מהם דרור צור יחשוב
רבי שלומות הררי [*עד] יקראו
מאט ידיד להם לבבו בחלי
תיקד בצלעו אש... כיוקד יקוד
הlek לבבו אחריהם בשבי

ולה זל יצא להם ווון יום סוב הידיד²⁵

אל מסני ידידים
לי פרשו מצדדים
עם חצי נזודים

עד תבא בסודם
תחד עם כבודם

יום פרדי פרידה רחמו
הימים לריבי קמו
כמעט בי אבני רגמו

נפשי מאנה הנחם
או בשעיף חלום תראם או

פ"ז

25 "Another poem by him to them, in the metre of 'יום סוב הידיד', The last words form the beginning of a *muwashshah* of Yehudah Halevi (*Diwan*, ed. BRODY, I, 186), the versification of which is imitated in Anatoli's poem.

תוך רשות מצודם
יתחמצ לנגדם

הרחיבו מדורות
בצורות צורורה
כי נפשי שכורה

חנוני מליצי רעי
לו הייתה בלכת²⁶ שועי
הם ארחו אבל בצלע

ולבבי בכל עת יחם
כי נפל ונלכד כתאו

פ"ז

הדרך וסקל
נוד השר יתוקאל
הסופר ושוקל

הן רוחי בידם
בירקרק [אדמדם]

יוادر הזמן שפנה
ונודדים לידם אנה
וליצחק גביר הבינה

איך אנשים ואיך אשכחים
ושלומי וכל מקראו

פ"ז

הימים למשרת
ונגדולה ותורת
כל חכמה בצדקה

הם מושלים באדם
בשניהם לבודם

אלת האצלים העלו
מאבות שורה נחלו
מן הרים חכמים שאלו

זה יורם וזה יוכחים
אין עולם כדאי²⁷ ומלואו

פ"ז

החסד בדתם
תטפי משפטם
בין עיניו וחותם

ובחלדם בעודם
על זכרם והודם

אנשי שם ואנשי מופת
וזך ללחם אשר הנופת
וישים זמן טוטפת

בורועיו ואם יקחם
יתוהתו בדגל פלא(ו)

פ"ז

Anatoli's closest friend in Sicily seems to have been Samuel b. Menahem (al-)Nafusi²⁸; he is, at least the poetical correspondent whose name figures most conspicuously in the fragments of the Diwan. Samuel was evidently a citizen of Palermo and we still have his poem, accompanied by a rhetorical epistle, in which he welcomed the arrival of the eminent visitor from "Edom," i.e. from a

26 The MS. has, בלבת.

27 MS.: כרא

28 He, or his family, originated in the district of Jabal Nafusa, in Tripolitania. On the Jewish communities of Jabul Nafusa see MANN, *Texts and Studies*, I, 412, note 2.

Christian country.²⁹ Anatoli did not wish, of course, to fall behind in poetic courtesy and duly replied with a no less ornate poem and an epistle no less rhetorical. The long poem by Samuel greeting Anatoli's arrival in Palermo starts with a hymn on the Creator, and develops Anatoli's praise by a curious transition. "He spread His high heavens by an utterance of His mouth and by His omnipotent might, He inspired with intelligence my friends, men of education, knowledge and wisdom—among them being Anatoli, a man who reveals deep secrets, a lion of knowledge, understanding and cleverness. He appeared, like shining morning, putting to shame by his brightness the Pleiads and Orion. . . . The glory of poets, descendant of righteous men, whose speech is a remedy for distressed souls. . . . His lips keep to knowledge and understanding, and he exposes the perfect law of God. When he speaks, he utters the purest language, and the holy tongue is his maid-servant." The epistle repeats the same praises—Wisdom is represented as putting on her best attire and receiving on the high road her chosen lover, Anatoli. Anatoli, as is to be expected, repays the compliments by expressing the same sentiments about Samuel.

MS. A, fol. 7v-12v

וכתב אליה רבי שמואל נפוסי חין דcolaה למדיינה³⁰

ואמרו קום ואל תנום תנומה
בכור בין רחבה יד ועכומה
לצור תולה [א]מה על בלימה
ובוחן לב וمبין תעלומה
וחי לעד ולו הדר ועצמה
וממשלתו מאד רבה ועצמה
ישרים יענו ישרו באימה
במאמר פה וגודל עצומה
מתי מוסר מתי דעה וחכמה
כפיר מדע ארי הבין וערמה
וחהפר בהדרו עש וכימה
ושכנו ממואר פניו פנימה
נאום פיהו מזור נש הלוומה
מתי שיר ואחותם כלמה
ואו חתו ולא ענו מא [ומה]
בערכו שיר [לשונם] נאלמה
לאל מבין [בני] מוסר תרומה

הקייזוני סעיפי המזמה
ענה שירה בחיך געים צרופה
וסות [מה] לל עדה וקרב להלל
ונסתירות כמו נגבות [לפנין]
ידועה לו... רהיז מלפנים
מלוכתו נכוונה עד לעולם
ועדי נפלאותיו מפעלותו
אשר מהח שחקו וארכיו
ואצל התבונה אל ידידים
כאנטולי אנוש גולה עמוקות
ועלה בעלות שחר בתלו
ואורמים אספו נגham לפניו
פאר המשרדים ננד ישרים
ידוע בין אשר בושו לפניו
ונלאו מענות את מהללו
שפתם נבערת מלהגות שיד
ובין אגר וועו חגר והורם

²⁹ This *lapsus linguae* (Norman Sicily, too, as a Christian country, belonged, of course, to *Edom*) reveals in a curious way to what degree the Jews of Sicily still regarded themselves as a part of Islamic civilisation.

³⁰ "R. Samuel Nafusi wrote to him when he entered the City." Palermo was usually called in Arabic *al-madina*, the city. See, for example, *Biblioteca Arabo-Sicula*, pp. 74 (from al-Idrisi, writing in 1159), 82, 89, 91 (from Ibn Jubair, writing in 1183). Moreover, Ibn Jubair says expressly: "The capital city is the most beautiful town of the island. Mohammedans call it *al-madina*, while among the Christians it goes under the name of Palermo" (*ib.*, p. 86).

³¹ We might perhaps read: *עיהודה*

ב... ביד רבה עצומה
ואותו רותה נופת ותמה
ומבין דת אליהם התמייה
ושפת קדש ואך היא לו לאמה
לכמוהו ואצל המזומה
והציב בעדו הבין לחומה
ושירת כל משורר שת זועמה
יחידתי לך סועה והומה
כתובה וחורשה וחתומה
בשירה מהרה חושה וקומה
דבש פיך ותהייה לי תקומה
ידיד בו אהגה עת [לין] וקומה
יצוה [לך] ביד נשאת ורמה

נאם פיהו ליד צמיד
ובין שפה לפיו תמיד

ותושיה לאטה טפתחתחו
ודדריה הניקתחו תעודה
שפתיו שומרות דעת ובינה
וצחות דברותיו בהגותו
אשר הטה אליהם נהרי בין
עד יסוד יסודות לחתודה
בשירו יعلז מר לב ויגיל
אהוב נפשי פדיותיך בנפשי
ועל לוח לבבי אהבתך
ואהבת עיננה לקראת ידיך
ומי יתן [ונתן] חבר ואדרה
[תה] לתה לך תקרב ותערב
ואל שדי ברכה עד בלי די

שקו טורי ידי משכיל
אשר חכמתו אגרמו

שאי אגרתי זמיריך / לאחי בינה ושיריך / ואני אבא אחיריך / ומלאתי את
דביריך / חכמתו בחוץ תרנה / ברוחבות תתן קולה / לבשה בגדי רננה / ותעד
גונמה וחליתה / עמלת בחוץ ברך / על אם הדרך / שש ומשי מלבושה / והענו
רכבה ופרשה / על מי מגוזות מתגהלת / וبنס רגננים נדגלת / לקראת דודה
הצח והאדום / דגול בא מאדום / גוע תחכמוניים / ברוך מבנים / יכilio לשון
ופטדה (ואחלמה)³² / יקר מכל כלי מלחה / דברי פיהו מעידים / סודיו
למודים / לדעת חכמה ומוסר להבין אמרוי בינה. לשונו צחות מדברת / סודיו
תושיה מבארת / שפטו דעת ותבונה שומרת / נגידי מלין³³ אומרת / אמרתו
בכור הבינה צרופה / ולשונו חרב שלופה / תועדה שודה הרותהו / וענקה
בינה העניקהתו / הוא המברר סתרי תעודות / איש החמודות / ונעים זמירות /
אמרותיו אמרות טהורות / הנבון המשכיל החכם והענו אנטוליו³⁴ / וכל אהבתו
ישלוו / ישא ברכיה שמורה ערוכה מהיושבי בשמיים / (ה)مبادיל בין מים /
[וּמְמַתָּא] שמואל שלומים [כר]געי ימים / וכחול ימים / הנכוף לחברתו /
להתענג בצחוף שפטו / מי יתנני כירחי קדם / בהיותי בחיק חולם ורודם /
ואסתופך בחדרי בינו / ואשכוב בצל חכמו / ויסוכך עלי אברתו / וינטלי
בחמלתו / ותהל עלי(י) תhalbתו / ותופע נגידי יפעתו / אשרי אנשיו העומדים סביב
לו / השומעים דבריו וshallו / ומצא חן וshall טוב בעיני אליהם ואדם. בימי
[י]בשר עם אביו / כי נחם יי' ציון.

³² The insertion of this word is not absolutely necessary; the poet might have missed a rhyme. On the other hand, by supplying the word we get an excellent rhyme and a smooth text.

³³ Or, דוברות.

³⁴ MS. has, אנטוליו. We have to read in all probability; this is a form of the name which is found quite often (cf. GROSS, *Gallia Judaica*, 371). It was probably pronounced Anatolio; on the other hand, in order to get his rhyme, Samuel has seemingly introduced the artificial pronunciation 'antolayū.

פגואה אנטולי בהדרת אלאביאת³⁵

ישתחווה השיר וגו ישוח
מבוא לעיניו נפתחו פתוח
על גג בליל כנף בלי אפרוח
שכלו ושם מצאה מנוח
אליו וטבה טבה טבה טבה
מדות יסודו שיר ובין לו טיה
דעו בריח בעדו לבrhoה
על נהרות דת פרחו פרוח
עורים ואוני חרשם לפוקה
הגה שבי עמו גם מלוקה
על שוא ותוּהוּ בט[חן] בטוח
תדקק לשון תרמיה אליל מלוקה
לקטפ ואו עלה בידם חוח
בים אלמים לא יוכלו לנבוח
אותם כגלגת אתה מוח
ותנה בעברתך ברגלים חוח
כלא וישחו בבור שכוח
בגדו ובקשו יד בך לשלהח
שיריך כבר נגע עדי זנוח
מלאך אליהם את והוא מנוח
ובך לבבות אמרו לשמו
המה לאט הולכים כמי שלוחה
מאט יקוטיאל אבי זנוח
זבחי תעוזות יעלת לזוחות
קמו ואותך משחו משוח
נשתח סביבות אהליך שטוח
גנון וגם הצל וגם פסוח
ניין כאשר מצא לפניו נוח
ירח תהלהך כמו ניחוח
הגדיל והרבה עד מאד לסלוח
לצבי חכם לב ואמץ כוח

ענואן אלכתאב³⁶

כִּי אַתְּ לְבָבִי אַחֲרֵיכֶם תְּמַשְׁכוּ
רוּחִי וְנִשְׁמַתִּי וְאַחֲרֵיכֶן לְכֹוּ

ותבעה בהדרת אלנטה³⁸

מלך ביפיו תחזינה עיניך / במשפט מעמיד ארץ / אין יוצאת ואין פרץ / פיו
חילים יגבר / ולשונו צח[ות] תדבר / מדבריו חלקיים מלחמות / ולכבו יהגה
אימות / אמונהות אומנותיו / והבינות בנותיו / חכמה קראה לפניו אברך /
ותאמר סרו אליישר דרכ / אשר נתיב השיר נכון לעיניו / אליו נבעו מצפוניו /
מוצא לשכל בטוחותיו / יפיקו חוצה מעינותו / באדר דעוו(ת) דלותו / ולשבור
צמאכם שתותנו / מעגלותינו יושר / ונתיבותינו כושר / המישר הדורים / במעשיין
ההדררים / גם בזרועו על ימי צוף שפטינו ארדה / אלבש דרור

³⁵ "Anatoli answered him by these verses."

מן : MS. 36

³⁷ "The address of the letter." ³⁸ "He followed up by this piece in prose."

כמו מדיין / כי נס והוסר כל מדיין / עיני זמן אשים בפוך קרוועות / אחר אשר
 הי בבכי קרוועות / אכבה מלבי אחים / הבעירו בלבי אחים / אשכח רישוי
 ואנשה כל נוד / בפנוי דוד / וגיל שוכב בבטן נאד / כי כל חשי וצביי / מצאתי
 בפנוי צביי / תור לחיי / ומשוש לחיי / גנדו אשתחווה אפים / מנה אחת אפים /
 נפש אתן בידו לפקדון / על רוחי אשימנו [א]דונן / אהבתינו ולא אعزבנו / אהזתינו
 ולא ארפנו / זה דודוי זהה רעי / זהה בלבד שעשועי / איש אשר רוח בו / ותבונת
 שדי בקרבו / הסבותי בר כל רעינוני / שמואל משרת את פני יי' / פני אליך
 מועדות / ולי בר עשר ידות / ברכות על ראנך תבוננה / ואלמותי לך
 תשתחווינה / דגלי שלומים אליך ילו / ולרגליך שרים ישתחוו / בן חכם איש
 אמונהות / רב תבונות / ידועascal ר' [מנחם] תרומית נדיבים / והוא בכתובים
 / הנני אנטולי פוקדך בשלומים / שלמים וכן רבים / שלוח אגרתי לפניך /
 למצווא חן בעיניך / ואך אם תקתן ואת לפנוי החכמוני / יכפר בעד [חסרונה]
 אדוני / כי ידעתה נקלה ורזה / נמ(א)סה ונמבהה / אל ישים לי אדוני עון בדבר
 זהה כי לא תשיג ידי לשלם נשי ואין אני תשרוה להביא לאיש האלים ועל כל
 פשעים תכסה אהבתך למען נוח עלייך גורל הצדקה והשלום.

The initial exchange of literary courtesies was soon followed by a regular series of poetical epistles (some of them accompanied by letters in rhetorical prose), a number of which can be read in the extant parts of the *Diwan* (MS A, fol. 12v-14v; B, 9, 26r-27v, 10r-11v; C, 2v [*muwashshah*], 8, 16-17. Some of the passages in the various MSS overlap; the same verses existing in parallel texts). They are conceived in the same style as the preceding ones and there is no point in giving them here. It may be mentioned that one of Samuel's poems was written on the occasion of an excursion of Anatoli to the town of *Mazara*³⁹. We have also the poems marking the end of the period spent in each other's company. The first of these poems of farewell written by Samuel on the departure of Anatoli is an attempt to persuade Anatoli to remain. "For you my heart jumps from its place and I am deeply worried if I do not see you. This is what happens even if both of us are together in the City, the graceful one, crowned with all beauty. How much more so if you, my beloved friend, want to go across the sea on the 'boards of departure' (a ship in Samuel's precious language). Stay with me and restore my heart, lest it perish, with your refreshing instruction!" But Anatoli was leaving. He took his way from *Palermo* by the northern coast of the island, passing through *Therma* (ancient *Thermae*, modern *Termini*). In that town he received a message

³⁹ MS. B, 9v-10r: "ובנה אליה ר' שמואל ענד ספרה אלי מיאור: R. Samuel sent to him on his journey to *Mazara*." corresponds to the usual Arabic spelling of the name; cf. M. AMARI, *Biblioteca Arabo-Sicula*, index s.v. *māzār* (p. 738). Anatoli and Samuel also exchanged poems on the occasion of an earthquake, MS. B, fol. 1r-2v: "וְרַב לֵי אַנְטוֹלֵי לְאַלְיֵי לְשָׁמָאֵל גּוּמְעָה אַלְוָלָה: R. Anatoli wrote to R. Samuel in the week of the earthquake." This earthquake may have been one of those mentioned by Ibn Jubair as having occurred during the reign of William II (1169-89) and in connection with which the Moslem traveller has a pretty tale to tell about the religious tolerance of the Norman ruler (*Biblioteca Arabo-Sicula*, p. 84). This would fix the time of Anatoli's stay in the island; on the other hand, earthquakes were probably not a rare event in Sicily.

from his solicitous friend whom he had left behind in Palermo, in the form of a poem expressing his yearnings towards the departed fellow-poet. The third poem was probably sent by Samuel to Messina. (MS. B, 7v-8v.)

וכתב ר' שמואל נפוסי לאנטולי ז"ל ענד ברוגה מן סקליה⁴⁰

וחברה בזזה בזזה⁴¹ [*וש]⁴² דדה
ובכו הדפה צבא פירוד ולכדה
להרכיבך ולך כרעה וסגדה
גביר דעתך בך חשקה וחמדה
אהביך ובך לעד אפודה
ואם לא אראך אחרך חרדה
בתוך קרייה כלילת הוד חמודה
לעבר ים עלי לוח פרידה
ואל יאבד והברני תזודה
ברוך יהי יהיה מшиб אבדה
ואו תהיה נות פרוד שדודה
לך דוד בעבור תהיה לעדה

התוכל לאסור רכב פרידה
וכבא רבתה נגודה ויצאת
ואסורה מרכבות אהב ואמרה
ואברך קראה נגדר למען
ידיד נפשי קשורה בעבותות
לך יתר לבבי ממקומו
וכל זאת יקרני ואחננו
ואף כי תüber אויש החמדות
שבה אתי והשב את לבבי
והמושלים ברנה יענו לך
ונשתעשע עלי ערש אהביהם
ושירתי בעד חשי שלוחה

פוצל אליו תרמה ובעת אליה⁴³

וזמן באשי הנדוד הפרה
ואשת יין פרוד עדי שכרה
איש התעוזות הוא בלבד נקרא
יוסף אשר בו חשקה מישרה
מתנייו (ו) להגות דת אמת סחרה⁴⁴
אף נחלתו במ הכי שפירה
אם ישבמו בו ימצאו עורה
שיר מענות חදלו ומוורה
יום מר ויום נורא ויום עברה
רבה וחליל חברה בעוז הורה
רע לכל השוכנים יערה
נד דוד ולנוד אוחביו הערת
ובעין לבבי מה מאד יקרה⁴⁵

מה לי ל��ות ענבי תברה
ופרי נודדים שבעה בטני
פרודachi של זריהיו
הבין נחלו מגביר דעות
גבר⁴⁶ אשר שנס בתם⁴⁷ לבב
מוסר ושכל טוב ידועים לו
מתין שאל מפיו נעים מהלך
לו שמעו שיריו בני אסף
היום אשר יום להפרד
מה עשה זמן צבאיו חיש
הנה נטשני בעוף נודד
צופה לכל דרך לבקש חן
דוד נפלאתה אהבתך לי

40 "R. Samuel Nafusi wrote to Anatoli when he left Sicily."

41 MS.: בזזה.

42 "He arrived at Termini and he (viz., Samuel) sent to him (the following poem)." This corresponds to the Arabic form *Tharma*, which renders the Graeco-Latin form of the name of the town *Thermae*, the modern Termini; cf. *Biblioteca Siculo-Arabica*, index, s.v. *Tharma*. In 1107 we hear of Jews in Termini: STRAUS, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

43 MS.: גבע.

44 MS.: גבר: רגס. (We might read also: גבר).

45 The text is doubtful.

46 Here the page ends; it cannot be said whether the poem is complete.

MS. C, fol. 13v.

ובעת ר' שמואל נפוצי לר' אנטולי ז"ל למא סאפר אליו מסיני הדה אלאביאת"

לבבות להטה לא הבגדים
ואולי הם יכבו היקודים
תעלה אחרי מסע יידים
וטוב להם והיו לאחדים
ושת עלי צבא יגון פקידים
ופרש לי חרמים עם מצודים
לרוואני עלי חשקי מעדים
ונעלה על כפרים עם נרדים
ומתקו מחרמאות עם מגדים
ואל כל יד ואורוע צמידים
וכל המשוררים לו לעבדים
מקור יושר וمبוע חסדים⁴⁷

תנו מים לכבות אש נודדים
הטילוני לפרפּר ואמנה
ומי נשרפּ באש פרוד היש לו
לבד התהברו אל דוד עזבו
אני גבר נטני יידי
וקלע הזמן אותי בקלעו
כלת רוח ונותס לחי بعد דוד
ידיד מנהו יפיחון הבשימים
ידיד טובו לכל פה אמרינו
ידיד שיריו לכל צואר רביבדים
ידיד אדון ושר על של וקצין
ידיד מעין עוז שיר יחבר

In Messina Anatoli made the acquaintance of Moses the *hazzan*, from the town of Reggio di Calabria, on the mainland coast of the Straits of Messina.

A poem of Anatoli's to Moses reads as follows: "Time has taken in pledge my heart like a creditor; how can I contain myself and be silent. It has put a yoke on my neck and its bond is hard and heavy. My loins are filled with burning, because I am exiled from all my family. The rains of tears have irrigated my cheeks and grey hair grows on them like grass. God, however, has showed great kindness to me and has made known his ways to Moses (*Moshe*). In truth, he (*Moses*), draws out (*moshe*) all those who are drowned in the sea of distress. Therefore I set in order for him an altar of praise and offer my soul upon it as a sacrifice." Moses replied with the following poem: "My heart faints like a deer out of desire for Anatoli, the son of Joseph. How precious are the necklaces of his praise, more than the gold of Ophir, more than silver. If they touched a dead man, he would revive after having given up his ghost. When will there be union for his love, when will there be an end for his separation? When will perfidious time again revive the distressed heart that it has torn to pieces? Those separated will then greatly rejoice, the heart of the lover will be gladdened by the meeting."

47 "R. Samuel Nafusi sent these verses to R. Anatoli when he travelled to Messina." It may have been that Anatoli went to Messina in order to take a ship from there to Alexandria; but it may have been an occasional visit.

48 Here the page ends.

MS. B, fol. 2v-3r.

ולרי' אנטולי ז"ל יכatab ר' משה חזן פי ריו⁴⁹

ואיך אוכל להתחפה ואחשה
ומוסרו מאד כבד וקשה
אני מכל בני שבטי מנשה
ושיבת צמחה⁵⁰ בהן כדשא
והודיע' דרכיו צור למשה
בצדק מעלה אותו ומושה
ונפשי עולה עליו לאשה

זמן חבל לבבי לו כנושה
ונתנו על בצוاري ומוטה
כסלי מלוא נקלה לمعنى
וגשמי הباقي השקו לחיי
אבל הגביר אלהים את חסדיו
וככל נטבע בימי המצוות
לזאת מזבח תהלהות אערוך לו

פנאובה ר' משה בהדא⁵¹

לבוי לאנטולי בנו יוסף
מכל זהב אופיר ומכסף
אחר אשר גוע בהאסף
מתי לפרודו יי' אוסף
אנוש אשר קרע וגם שף
יגל לבב חושך בהתאסף

יעטף כמו איל ויכסף
מה יקרו טורי תחלותינו
לו פגעו במת או' חיה
מתי תחא חברה לאהבותנו
ישיב זמן בוגד להחיות לב
תרבה או' שמחה לנפרדים

Several poems mention another friend of Anatoli, whose full name can be established as follows: Abu' l-Surur Peraḥyah ibn al-Khayr (al-)Halabi. As his name shows, he (or his family) originated in Aleppo, but we may assume that he was living in Sicily and it was there that Anatoli made his acquaintance.

Peraḥyah, like the other friends of Anatoli, also affected literary taste and solicited Anatoli, who probably counted as the outstanding poetical talent of the circle, for some verses. He had already heard Anatoli recite his poetry, now he would like to have some lines of his in writing. (I imagine that this is the purport of Peraḥyah's distich. If this supposition is correct, it would cast an interesting sidelight on the literary habits of the circle.) Anatoli replies politely that he will comply with his wishes though he is unable to describe fittingly Peraḥyah's manifold favours. His verses are only the result of the inspiration he has received from Peraḥyah. But Peraḥyah modestly rejects any such claim in a little poem, the metre and the rhymes of which exactly correspond to those of Anatoli's poem.

וכתב ר' פרחה הוקן הלבוי לאנטולי⁵²

ועיני עד מאד תחאב ראותם
וחרויזיך מאד יקר פדותם
ומה יתרון לך חביון אמרים
ועם כל שומעם כרתו בריתם

49 "A poem by R. Anatoli in which he addresses himself to R. Moses Hazzan in Reggio." ריו is a transcription of the Arabic form of the name; cf. *Biblioteca Siculo-Arabica*, index s.v. *Rayyu* (p. 733). The Arabic form is in its turn modelled upon the Greek name of the town, *Region*, in its Byzantine pronunciation: *Riyyo(n)*.

50 MS.: שמיה.

51 "R. Moses answered with the following."

52 "R. Peraḥyah ha-zaqen (=al-shaykh) Halabi wrote to Anatoli."

פגאוכה ר' אנטולי ז"ל⁵³

כלבך ודברך לשמור
או עד אשר יול קטל מזמור
לא עצרה כח ואון לאמור
אם יעלה אל אפק תמור
ואגנבה ריח צורר המור
על כפיק הגביר למגור

על כפיק הגביר למגור
עד יערף השיר כמו מטר
מרבית חסידיך לספר רק
פָן תחשב רוכל כמו רכילד
אך נאצל מריח עלי⁵⁴
ואתנה את זה תשורה כי

פר[א]געה הוקן ר' פרחהיה בהדא⁵⁵

אי רעיזון שיר אחריו לאמור
חת הר בשמיים יעללה תמור
תוועה בעורך חן צבי לחמור
חד מפודוטין יקו לשמור⁵⁶
החק לבך כל אונש למגור
וצורך אמריך צורר המור

חונן וען נשמר בתוך מזמור
יתרה כמגרעת לרכול ת-
עריך ענק טוב שיר לשגנתו
דורש מצוא מדע מרומי שיר
יום בו קרווא טורי תהלותיו
הן כל צורר אומרים צוררaben

תשובה ששה הטורים משאת היקר אנטולי פאר המשוררים ראשית בכוון

On another occasion Perahyah complains of his separation from his friend and entreats him to send him, at least, a letter.

ויאיצי בעת אליה ابو אל סרוור בן אלכידר⁵⁷

ומרפ[א] לנפשות הוא ומחייב
אשר יעשה אונש אותם וחייב
והחולמים במשכבים מחייב
ויאיך תהיה אליו נפשי תהיה
כמו שאגט ארי יער וחייב
ויתנהם במראו לב פרחהיה

לדוד נחמד שמו נקרא זרחה
ישר דרך במצות אל ודתו
ואהבתו צרי אל כל ידידיו
ויאיך דודים יחי אחריו לבבי
לפרודו אני הומה ושואג
ומי יתן כתב ידו לנשך

When Perahyah died, Anatoli composed a cycle of dirges: one for each day of the week of mourning and one for the end of the month (MS. C, 9r-13r). The different pieces are composed in a great variety of metres, ranging from the *qasida* and the traditional dirges of the Spanish school to the most diverse strophical forms. Different allusions in these dirges show that Perahyah was a person of some consequence; Anatoli also mentions two of his sons, Moses and Meborak, who inherited their father's high position. I give a few strophes as specimens to exemplify the variety of metres used by Anatoli.

53 "R. Anatoli replied to him."

54 "Ha-zagen R. Perahyah reciprocated with the following."

55 This hemistich is not clear to me.

56 "Abu-l-Surur b. al-Khayr also sent to him."

כִּי מֵת אֲדִירָה	תֹּרְהָ בָּכִיָּה
וּנְפַל גְּבוּרָה	כְּשַׁל שְׁלִישָׁה
וְתַגְזָן נָזְרָה	וְחַכְמָה הַוּמִיהָ
וַיְחַולֵּל נָזְרָה	כִּי יַרְדֵּה הַדָּרָה
זִוְּה וְהַדָּרָה	וַיֵּצֵא מִמְּנָה

יַרְדֵּוּ בֵּית שְׁפָלוֹן	מַבְתִּי גַּבְהָן
---------------------------	-------------------

* * *

סְפָדוֹ עַל שָׁר נָאָסָף
עַל בֵּין זְרוּעַ חַשְׁפָּה
חַכְמָות יִקְרֹות אַסְף

חִיצְוֹנוֹת פְּנִימִיּוֹת	הַיּוֹ לְפָנָיו גְּלִוּוֹת
---------------------------	----------------------------

* * *

לְבִי נְחָלָה וּנְהִיא
עַל מָות הַשָּׁר פְּרָחָה
אַחֲרָיו הַלְּךָ בְּשִׁבְיָה

עַד נְחַשְׁבָו נְכָרִיוֹת	עַיִנִי לוֹ בּוֹכִיוֹת
---------------------------	------------------------

* * *

וּרְוחַ חָן וּתְהִנְנוּנִים
יִשְׁפּוֹךְ צָור מְמֻעָנוֹנִים
עַל בְּנִים נָאָמְנִים

סְגָלַת מְרַגְּלִיוֹת	חִמְדָת גְּלִיוֹת
-----------------------	-------------------

* * *

אֶלָּה בְּנֵי הַיְצָהָר
זֶה כְּבָרוֹשׁ וּזְהַתְּהִיר
כְּמוֹ סִינִי וּזְוֹקֵר הָר

אֲשֶׁר עַיִנִי צְוִיפּוֹת	הַמָּה הַתְּלִפּוֹוֹת
---------------------------	-----------------------

* * *

הַעֲטָרָה וְהַנּוֹר	וְהַוְסָרָה	נְעָדרָה
בְּקַרְבָּנוֹ זַיְקָ תָּאֹר	וְהַדָּאגָה	וְהַתּוֹגָה
וּמַיְצָךְ תַּיִ אַתָּר	וּמַיְגַּבָּר	מַיְגַּבָּר
וּמַיְכָבָר יִתְאֹר	וְיַלְבַּשׁ עָתָה	וּמַיְיעָז
וְאֹולֶת יַד וְאַיִן צָוָר	וְמַהְ נָעָנָה	לִמְיָנָפָנָה
הָאוֹמֵר וְהַגּוֹתָר	לִיְשְׂרָאֵל	לְבָדְ הָאָל
לֹא יַאֲמִין בְּקָדוֹשָׁיו	רָם וּנוֹרָא בְּשָׁחָקָיו	

* * *

לא אשמעה קולך ומה שיחך
שנפחו ימים במפוחך
משאנני משכנות בטחך
הרפה זמן הרפה מעט רוחך
לו תענה אליו ואוכיחך

.....

זה חדש עבר ותם ירחד
ובתווך צלעיו אש אנחות נפחה
איך עלו זוד והדרך הזמן
ואומרה ברבות יגוני אחלי
עשוק אני מידך מה עשה

רליך וצדך יהלוך נכחך
היא נפשך ברה זיך ללחך
ובגן אלהים יהיה נוחך
בשם להעתג בטוב רקהך
כי כסיך האזר ומבטהך
אנשי גאליך וכל אחיך

השקט גביר עמי עדי תקום לגור
הבר והנבר והישר וכן
על קברך ישכון רצון שוכני סנה
לروعות צעופר או צבי על הררי
כח מטך משה רעה את צאנך
ובשם מבורך עמק יתברכו

At the end of the mourning cycle the poet signs his name in a few lines :

MS. C. 13r.

ובדם סגור לא בדיו נכתבו
לקונן אותו על השדר הגדול פרחה
תחת התמר וההתפה אמן⁵⁷

קינים מצור לבבות נחצבו
חבר מחברותם הצעיר ורחה
נפשו בגין עדן תנוח

Although we have only fragments of Anatoli's poetical works and a judgment on his poetry would seem in these circumstances to be somewhat hazardous—nevertheless, as the many fragments apparently derive from different parts of the *Diwan* they may rightly be regarded as representative of the whole. The largest number of Anatoli's poems, as well as those of his colleagues, is devoted to the theme of friendship. Friendship played a great part in Spanish poetry, too ; but there it was overshadowed by the still more important category of "patronage." Here in Sicily, the Hebrew poet did not live, as he did in Spain, in the "court" of a Jewish grandee, to whom he addressed his *qasidas* of praise ; poetry in Sicily was cultivated by members of the learned professions—*dayyans* and *hazzans* ; it has an air of dilettantism, and was a pastime of scholarly men.

On the other hand, some aspects of Spanish courtly society are still alive in the Sicilian poetry. The grave scholars—as we have to imagine the worthy Anatoli and his friends—did not consider it beneath them to accompany their convivial banquets with gay bacchic songs written in the most perfect Spanish style. (The witty allusions of the original cannot be rendered adequately in translation.)

"My honoured friend, listen to my chosen words and declare wine a traitor. The vine became pregnant from the som

⁵⁷ Other people mentioned in the *Diwan* are: *al-ra'is al-jalil* (i.e., the eminent notable R. Jacob Halevi ibn al-Rabib, MS. A, fol. 5v; B, fol. 3-2, "Jacob"); and *al-ka'ib* (i.e., the secretary, a government official) *al-shaykh Abu-'lfad* (MS. B, fol. 12v, 13v).

of the cloud, very soon it bore a male child. Spill its blood with a knife, nobody will care to revenge its blood. Consider its cost as not worth mentioning and call the publican who sold it a generous man. In a crystal cup give me of that excellent wine so that I may perhaps become drunk. If you can guess at my meaning I shall offer a present for your table.

“ From the shadow of the rooms, my friends, let us go to the gardens, to touch the branches of the palm tree, to regard the flower beds that are filled with the tears of the clouds—on hearing their crying the flowers laugh. The earth has doffed its wintry garments and put on, for golden embroidery, the green grass, and for purple, the flowers. Slowly, my friends, let us walk on slowly, because your carpets are the roses. Be sure to sing with voices like the birds that whistle on the top of the trees. Drink to the voice of the turtle that sings on the branch of the tree, while the dove perches above. The friends will enjoy themselves sitting in the shadow of the bushes, resting gaily ; because the hills are girdled with rejoicing and songs echo from the tops of the mountains. Today all the joys have made a tryst in your company, with the pleasant melodies and jubilant songs. Spill the blood of the grape and from its blood sprinkle the water of friendship on your faces. Let the cups shine like lamps against the company of friends in the dark night and let them spread light through the windows. Drink your cup to my health and I shall drink ten cups to yours.”

(To be continued)

S. M. STERN

Oxford

KOHELETH ON WISDOM AND WEALTH

It is one of the current misconceptions about Koheleth that he is refuting wisdom as such, and that his work is directed against the wisdom-teaching of his time. Koheleth was himself a wisdom-teacher, and his view on wisdom as well as his other leading ideas can be understood only in connection with a correct appraisal of the development of the Jewish wisdom on the one hand, and of the literary form and intent of his book on the other. As everywhere, wisdom developed in Israel from life experience, and the ancient sages were men of position, royal scribes, and state functionaries, like the men of Hezekiah (Prov. xxv, 1). Later, in post-exilic times, there emerged a special class of wisdom-teachers, who acted as educators of the youth and maintained schools. With this development, Jewish wisdom became impregnated with the ethical-religious ideas of the Torah and Prophets ; it stressed the point that the fear of God is the beginning and end of wisdom (Prov. i, 7—xv, 33 ; Job xxviii, 28). It was from this class of wisdom-teachers that so independent a thinker as Koheleth came. As recognised by some modern commentators, he, too, wishes to stress the importance of the fear of God, as stated at the end of the book (xii, 13). His so-called "pessimism" is only a mask, which he assumed in order to express more fully the folly and vanity of man and his complete dependence on God. Assuming the rôle and experience of Solomon, who combined both wisdom and wealth, Koheleth concludes that wealth does not provide the ultimate satisfaction and happiness, while wisdom leads to "vexation" by opening the wise man's eyes to the vanity and folly of all undertakings "under the sun." Hence, wisdom *alone*, regarded in the usual empirical sense as the observation of the facts of (social) life, has no positive value. Like the prophets and the Psalmist (cf. Isa. xxix, 14 ; Jer. ix, 22 ; and Psalm xlix, 7), with whom his deliberations show a great affinity, Koheleth aims his remarks at the type of "worldly" wealthy man who in his pride thinks himself wise. In his assumed rôle of Solomon, the wisest man on earth, Koheleth concludes that no man can solve the mysteries of the world (vii, 23, 24). The sense of eternity is implanted in man's heart, but being only a mortal creature man cannot fathom all the acts of God (iii, 11).

This conclusion, however, does not in any sense imply a denial of the *moral* worth of (true) wisdom, as emphasised throughout the Jewish wisdom-literature. Reporting on his "experiment" in the use of wealth to pursue the (sensual) pleasures of life, Koheleth remarks (ii, 3) that his mind retained his wisdom throughout. These words indicate that wisdom saved him in the end from that senseless licentiousness, which is identical with folly (ii, 17). Though observing that the wise man as well as the fool is subject to the

accidents of time and the caprices of fate, Koheleth stresses the advantage of wisdom over folly, because "the wise has the eyes in his head while the fool walks in darkness" (ii, 14). From the negative result of his "experiment," Koheleth proceeds directly to the positive conclusion that true happiness and joy is a gift of God, secured not by wealth but by toil (ii, 24; iii, 13; v, 10, 11). This is the answer to the question posed at the beginning of the book (i, 3): "What advantage has man from his toil?"

Positive assertions about the correct conduct of life and the (moral) worth of man occur more often in the latter part of the book (vii, 1ff.). Here Koheleth stresses further the value of wisdom (vii, 11, 12, 19; vii, 1, 5; ix, 18). Wishing to extol the advantages of wisdom, other wisdom-books give a somewhat exaggerated picture of the social prestige of the wise man and his influence on rulers (Ben Sirah xxiii, 14; xxxviii, 33, 39). Though Koheleth agrees that the wise man deserves a high social position, as a realist he knows that this ideal is not generally realised. The sage is frequently poor; as a result, he cannot attain the proper social status which would enable him to exercise considerable influence on public life. To illustrate this point, he tells (ix, 14-16) the imaginary story of a poor man who though he saved a besieged city by his wisdom remained unrecognised.¹ From this case Koheleth concludes that, although wisdom is more valuable than power, the wisdom of the poor man is despised and his words go unheeded (ix, 16). However, this conclusion is not meant to express the "futility" of wisdom, as some modern commentators maintain. Quite the contrary. A little later (ix, 18; x, 1) Koheleth emphasises that wisdom is superior to weapons. Koheleth's purpose is rather to demonstrate the folly and vanity of social life, where prestige is bound with wealth and wisdom cannot gain recognition. As is the case throughout the book, a negative statement serves to emphasise the positive idea—here explicitly stated—of the value of wisdom and the place it should have in public life. The conclusion to be drawn from the fact that the poor sage lacks social prestige is that it is advisable to combine wisdom with wealth (vii, 11, 12). Reading *minnahalah* instead of *'im nahalah*, some commentators try to interpret the meaning to be that wisdom is better than wealth. This rendering would seem to be in line with the idea expressed in ix, 18, that wisdom is superior to, and more effective than, material weapons even in war time. However, this rendering is impossible: first, because *nahalah* does not mean "wealth," but an inherited estate, and it cannot be supposed that Koheleth justifies the poverty of the wise by the cynical argument that wisdom is more valuable than material means; secondly, because the proposed reading that

¹ ix, 15: *lo zakhar* means not only that no one remembered this poor sage, in the sense of showing gratitude to him, but that no one cared any longer to profit from his wisdom.

"he who is in the shadow of wisdom is in the shadow of money as well" contradicts flatly the statement in ix, 16, about the poor sage. For like reasons we must also reject proposed interpretations, which either through a change in the text (reading *ba'al* instead of *beṣel*) or by reference to a supposed mistranslation from an alleged Aramaic original, explain the meaning to be that "he who possesses wisdom possesses money as well."² A realist like Koheleth could not be credited with such a statement, which is certainly not confirmed by experience. The Massoretic text is therefore quite correct³; the meaning is that wisdom combined with an inheritance is advantageous, because the material means provide security and independence and enhance the social prestige of the wise. This argument, which conforms to the idea expressed in the passage ix, 17f., to the effect that the poor sage lacks social prestige, is an expression of the common view. As for Koheleth himself, although he is much concerned with raising the social prestige of the wise man so that he may be able to exercise due influence on public life, the advantage of wisdom consists primarily in its (moral) value for the individual himself. Hence he goes on to explain that the real advantage of wisdom consists in that it preserves the life of its possessor. These words intend to convey the thought that wisdom leads to the right way of life and protects its possessor from all kinds of internal and external dangers (cf. Prov. xv, 33). Since, however, this idea is cited in favour of the argument that wisdom should be combined with an inheritance, the implication here is that, lacking security and means of livelihood, the wise man may be prompted to accept material assistance from others, and consequently be deprived of his independence at the cost of his wisdom. Our surmise is that vii, 7: "for a bribe turns a wise man into a fool and a gift perverts understanding," which in its present position is a *non sequitur*, belongs after vii, 11, 12.⁴ Since the term '*osheq*', which has here the meaning of a bribe, is elsewhere (v, 7) used by Koheleth with regard to the oppression of the poor, it is rightly supposed by some commentators (Delitsch) that the reference is here to the acceptance of bribes by judges. This verse may contain an allusion to Exod. xxiii, 8, which forbids the acceptance of bribes on the same ground—that it perverts judgment. This meaning may be relevant here, because the wise men frequently acted as judges (Ben Sirah xxxviii, 33), and the poor among them may have been tempted to derive an income by the acceptance

² Thus H. L. GINSBERG (*Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* xxi, 1952, p. 50), following TUR-SINAI, *Ha-lashon weha-sefer* ii, 402.

³ *Beṣel hahokhmah beṣel hakesef* can mean not only that the possessor of money and wisdom lies in the shadow of both of them, but that other people take cover under his shadow (cf. *Seder Elijahu Rabbah*, xxxi, p. 64). This means that people are attracted by the wise man and seek his protection (cf. Prov. xix, 4).

⁴ As proposed by HERTZBERG in his Commentary on Koheleth; he, however, adheres to the interpretation that wisdom is better than money.

of bribes. It is, however, probable that Koheleth is here protesting in general against the acceptance of gifts by the wise (cf. Prov. xv, 27).⁵ This saying of Koheleth has a close parallel in different sayings of the rabbis, who similarly protested against the acceptance of bribes and gifts by wise men.⁶ The Midrash (Koheleth Rabbah to vii, 11, 12) also noted the parallel between this passage in Koheleth and the saying of Rabbi Gamaliel, the son of the patriarch Rabbi Judah the First ('Aboth ii, 2), to the effect that wisdom should be associated with a worldly occupation. Whenever and wherever Torah is not accompanied by (manual) work it is doomed to failure. The warning against the use of the Torah for material gain was delivered earlier by R. Zadok (first century), and before him by Hillel ('Aboth iii, 5). Koheleth similarly advises the disciples of wisdom to support themselves and not to look for support from others. It is, however, noteworthy that while Rabbi Gamaliel, in speaking of work probably had manual trades in mind as well as farm work, in which indeed many of the rabbis engaged, Koheleth speaks of an "inheritance." He apparently considered it normal for the wise man to be the owner of a landed estate, which ensured his material security and independence and provided him with the opportunity to use the wisdom for his moral benefit and not for material gain. This conclusion is in line with the preference expressed elsewhere by Koheleth for agriculture and agricultural work (cf. v, 8).

This apparent preference must be viewed in the light of the contemporary social conditions and of the economic status of the wise. According to an opinion, which is at the present widely shared by scholars, the early Jewish sages belonged to the upper social classes.⁷ This view is based on certain explicit utterances by Ben Sirah, who asserts that the farmer and the craftsman cannot attain wisdom, which is reserved only for him who avoids business (Ben Sirah xxxviii, 24, 33). These utterances are paralleled in certain passages of Egyptian literature, which depict the advantages of the scribe's position over that of the poor farmer and other workers. The wise man alone is exempt from the burden of taxation and of the forced labour which is imposed on others.⁸ It is interesting to note that similar statements are to be found in the rabbinic literature. Thus, Rabbi Nechunyah ben Hakanah says ('Aboth iii, 5) that he who imposes upon himself the yoke of Torah is freed from the political and economic yoke.

In order correctly to appraise these statements, their aim and tendency must be kept in mind. Wisdom-literature calls the masses

⁵ 'Osheq can also have the meaning of gift (cf. GORDIS, *Koheleth, the Man and His Work*, ad loc.). It is quite possible that Koheleth uses it in a double sense of gift and oppression (since the bribe causes the oppression of justice).

⁶ *Megillah* 28a; *Sotah* 47b.

⁷ Cf. SMEND, *Weisheit, Jos. Sirachs*, 345; VOLTZ, *Hiob u. Weisheit* 105; GORDIS, in *Hebrew Union College Annual*, xviii, 77f.

⁸ See ERMAN, *Egyptian Literatur*, 193, 196; cf. ERMAN'S remarks 1. c., 188.

to turn to wisdom and embrace it (Prov. i, 20 ; viii, 1f.). This appeal has its parallel in such rabbinical passages that urge the study of Torah and denounce those who neglect it (cf. 'Aboth vi, 2). However, common people are kept busy by their daily occupations and have neither the time nor the interest to devote to wisdom. As the Talmud puts it (Yoma 35b), the rich argue that they are kept busy by their fortunes, while the poor argue that they have to work for a livelihood and cannot spare the time for study. To counteract these arguments and to induce the youth to study wisdom, it is stressed that wisdom brings with it more advantages than any other occupation. Proverbs (iii, 16), therefore, state that wisdom brings wealth and honour. With the probable purpose of dissuading people from engaging in commerce, which detracts from study, it is stated (Prov. iii, 14 ; viii, 19 ; xvi, 16) that wisdom is more valuable than gold, silver, and jewellery. In fact, we find in the wisdom-literature strong attacks on the rich (cf. Prov. xxiii, 4, 5 ; Ben Sirah x, 23) ; the wisdom-literature seems to have a special bias against large-scale business, which exposes those who engage in it to all kinds of "worldly" temptations and estranges them from wisdom and religion. This feature is especially visible in Koheleth, who places so much stress on the fact that the pursuit of profit cannot bring real happiness, and that the worker can rest (and by implication be more happy) far better than the rich man, whose wealth disturbs his sleep (Koheleth v, 11).

It is therefore inadmissible to see the Jewish wisdom-teachers as representatives of the upper social classes, since all their teaching is, in fact, directed against the type of mentality represented by the latter. However, as suggested by Koheleth (vi, 11), and as may be concluded also from the above-mentioned saying of Ben Sirah, apparently the wisdom-teachers were frequently landowners, as were many of the rabbis. The same passages in Koheleth suggest, however, that by his time there had sprung up a class of impoverished wisdom-teachers who were dependent on the rich for their support, a fact which gave Koheleth concern and aroused his protest.⁹

Ch. W. REINES.

New York.

⁹ Compare also Ben Sirah's comments on the poor sage (x, 23 ; xiii, 22, 23), which closely resemble the comments of Koheleth ix, 16. Concerning the low economic status of the *soferim* (scribes). See L. FINKELSTEIN, *Haperushim We'anshe Keneseth Haggadolah*, 71.

NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

1. REMARKS ON THE YIDDISH KUDRUN

In the *Journal of Jewish Studies*, vol. IV, No. 4 (1953), pages 176-181, L. Fuks gives the first report of a Yiddish Kudrun preserved in a manuscript of the Cambridge University Library. Germanic scholars are duly grateful for this preliminary notice, and we all hope that Fuks will be able to print his version of the manuscript as soon as ever possible.

There are one or two slight points which might be mentioned at this stage: Hans Ried, who was employed by the Emperor Maximilian, wrote his Ambras manuscript between the years 1502 and 1515. He is in no sense a composer, and not even a compiler. Fortunately for us, he copied slavishly what was in front of him, and his errors are therefore easily detectable. The only alteration the scribe allowed himself was to modernise the forms of the words.

The Kudrun is merely a part, and a small part at that, of the extensive book which he produced. It is most likely that the Kudrun goes back to an older manuscript of the beginning of the thirteenth century, the so-called *Heldenbuch an der Etsch*, which was already a collection of a number of different epics. This *Heldenbuch* is unfortunately no longer extant.

The composition of this *Heldenbuch* can no longer be determined with complete accuracy, and it would not be easy to prove that there are two separate sources for the Kudrun, as stated by Fuks. However, he will no doubt argue his case in due course, and we are looking forward to hearing his views.

The manuscript which Ried wrote found its way into the castle at Ambras, where Archduke Ferdinand II (1529-1595) collected amongst many other art treasures a magnificent library. In 1596 there were three thousand four hundred books in the castle, some of them extremely rare. Later on, the whole of the Ambras collection was transferred to the Imperial Library at Vienna, now the National Library. The manuscript is still in the National Library at Vienna.

Mr. Fuks refers to the Hilde story as the "second" part of the epic. Strictly speaking, and looking at it from the outside, that is so. We first have the story of the youth and fabulous adventures of Hilde's father, then the story of Hilde (the oldest part probably going back to a continental Anglian poem composed not later than 400 A.D.), and then the story of Hilde's daughter Kudrun, which is largely a rehash of the Hilde story. The "first" part, the story of Hagen, is obviously very late. There is nothing traditional in it, and it has always been rightly regarded as a mere "prelude." In

the literature on the subject, therefore, "first" part is naturally taken to be the Hilde story, "second" part the Kudrun story. For the sake of clarity it would be better to follow the normal practice when this very important new text is published.

London.

F. NORMAN.

2. KOHELETH VIII, 10

בָּבִין רָאִיתִי רְשֻׁעָם קְבָרִים וּבָאוּ וּמִקּוּם קָדוֹשׁ Koheleth viii, 10: *ילְכֹו וַיְשַׁתְּבָחוּ בָּעֵיר אֲשֶׁר כֵּן עָשׂוּ נִמְזָה וְהַבָּל* is one of the most difficult passages in the whole book. The difficulty rests particularly with the second half of the verse, which is quite incomprehensible. The various interpretations and emendations proposed to it have not succeeded in making the verse intelligible. To understand its meaning, one must note that the intent is here not to contrast the unhappy lot of the righteous (who are forgotten after their death) with the undeservedly happy lot of the wicked—as wrongly believed by some commentators. The verse as a whole declares that after their death and burial the evil deeds of the wicked are quickly forgotten and their graves are held in veneration. The reading of the Massoretic text *וַיְשַׁתְּבָחוּ* is therefore quite correct, and there is no need to emend it into *וַיְשַׁתְּבָהוּ*, meaning "praised," as some commentators, following the rendering of the Septuaginta, propose. This rendition is inappropriate, since the dead are eulogised at their funerals and not afterward in the city (cf. R. Gordis, *Koheleth, The Man and His Work*, pp. 174, 285). Assuming that all the verbs of this verse have the wicked men as their subject, we propose by a slight alteration to read *וּבָאִים מִקּוּם קָדוֹשׁ ubha'im maqom qadosh*. The meaning is thus that the wicked are buried and come to rest (cf. Is. lvii, 2; Gen. xv, 15) in the grave. That the grave should be termed *maqom qadosh* is not surprising, although this designation does not actually occur in Biblical and post-Biblical Hebrew literature. The Romans called a cemetery *locus religiosus*, and it is usual among Jews to this very day to designate it as "the holy place." In the synagogue inscriptions *'athra qadisha* occurs as term for the synagogue (Montgomery, *Journal Biblical Literature* 1924, p. 243). This, however, does not exclude the possibility that the same term may have been used also for the cemetery. The original meaning of the term *maqom qadosh* is that the place is considered "sacred" and is withdrawn from profane use. Now according to the rabbinic law which certainly preserved an ancient Jewish custom, graves, like all the objects belonging to the dead, are forbidden for profane use (*Sanhedrin* 47b; 48a). A Baraitha (*Megillah* 29a) states that cemeteries should not be profaned in any way—they should not be used as pasture grounds and their grass

should not be gathered for hay.¹ It is remarkable that there is a similar prescription beginning with the same words ('eyn *nohagin bahen qaluth rosh*) with regard to the synagogue (l. c. 28). It has been repeatedly remarked that the grave was the oldest sanctuary of humanity. This assumption, however, is somewhat too broad; in ancient Israel we find few signs of the so-called "cult of the dead," in the usual sense of the term. However, the idea of the "sanctity" of the dead (including his burial place and belongings) did indeed exist in Israel, and underlies the religious usage. Although there was no developed worship in Israel of the dead, as it existed among the Arabs, Greeks, and other nations, the graves of ancestors were apparently held in high veneration.² Koheleth, in his unique way, uses the designation *maqom qadosh* ironically; it is only after the death of the wicked that their graves are held in veneration. This may also imply that sometimes the wicked are buried in dignified graves near those of righteous men. The verb that follows, *yehalkhu*, takes the wicked for its subject, and means "they depart" (cf. Koheleth i, 4 and ix, 10. *bishe'ol 'asher 'ata holekh shamma*). The dead are not considered to have completely left the realm of the living until they are buried.³ After their burial they are quickly forgotten and their evil deeds are no longer remembered in the city.⁴ Koheleth is here expressing the same idea about the wicked that he does about the righteous ones (ix, 5)—that there is no reward for them; they are not remembered. And, as it is true of Koheleth's other negative and pessimistic observations, this too may not be his last word. He shares the idea that ethically speaking, the name of the righteous lives for ever (cf. Koheleth vii, 1). However, as a realist, he is here noting that with their burial the dead are cut off from the realm of living, that the wicked and the righteous receive the same burial, and their memory is quickly extinguished among the survivors.

Ch. W. REINES.

New York.

¹ The ancient Arabs likewise considered cemeteries sacred places, which were forbidden for use as pasture lands and the like (cf. WELLHAUSEN, *Reste Arabischen Heidentums*, 163.)

² Cf. Psalms xvi, 3, *liqdoshim 'asher ba'ares*. According to Midrash Psalms (quoted by Rashi *ad loc.*), the reference is to the ancestors who are buried in the land. This interpretation is in our view preferable to the suggestion made by GUNKEL (Commentary to Psalms *ad loc.*) that this designation refers to the pagan gods, since the word *ba'ares* points rather to the dead.

³ Therefore, according to Jewish law, mourning starts after the burial.

⁴ According to a rabbinic saying (*Berakhoth*, 58b), it is ordained that the memory of the dead should be erased from the heart. A modern Jewish proverb says that "What the earth covers must be forgotten." As is well known, it is considered a disrespect to the dead to speak evil of them and to offend them.

CURRENT LITERATURE

KARL ELLIGER, *Studien zum Habakkuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie herausgegeben von GERHARD EBELING, No. 15), Tübingen, J. C. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1953. Pp. xiii, 1-302. Beilage, *Der Hebräische Text des Habakkuk-Kommentars vom Toten Meer (D S H) in Umschrift*. Pp. 1-45.

In this voluminous book on the Habakkuk Scroll, the author, Professor at Tübingen, propounds the astonishing thesis that the correct practice of the scientific method of research is to study the Habakkuk Scroll (as, indeed, any other Dead Sea Scroll), not in conjunction with the other documents, but in itself, with the help of a dictionary and grammar. The results of the application to the Habakkuk Scroll of this method, which amounts in effect to a recommendation to disregard the available sources of information, will hardly cause surprise. The subject matter of the Scroll is declared to be a conflict between a High Priest of the Jerusalem Temple and another Priest, the *moreh ha-sedeq*, notwithstanding the fact that the sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls prohibited the consumption of animal food and had no use for animal sacrifices or sacrificing priests. The author tells a long story about the trial of the *moreh ha-sedeq*, his imprisonment, and the serious disease he contracted while in custody—all of which is based on an imaginary text supplied by the author himself to fill a gap in the manuscript. The passage in the Scroll saying that those who believe in the *moreh ha-sedeq* will be saved from the flames of hell—as clearly Christian as anything could be—is glossed over in silence. The other clearly Christian passage, that God will hand over to his Elect the judgment of mankind, implying that the Elect is a divine person, is first eviscerated by the author, who asserts that "Elect" is plural, not

singular (thus a new religion is invented which promulgates a plurality of divine persons who will judge mankind), and secondly, by a sleight-of-hand, the judges are converted into prosecutors and witnesses all in one. The alleged contradiction in the Scroll, which states in one passage that God will judge mankind at the Last Judgment and in another that the Elect will be the judge, is duly noted by Professor Elliger, who ascribes it to "Inkonzinnität" on the part of the author of the Scroll, but there is an exact parallel in Paul, who talks of "the tribunal of Jesus" and "the tribunal of God" in the same breath, is ignored.

"The Kittiim" of the Scroll who sacrifice to their standards, are conceded by the author to be Romans, but they must be of the Republican period, although there is no evidence for such sacrifice except during the Empire. The circumstance that the author of the Scroll, referring to Hab. I, 10, comments upon the word "kings" at the end of his passage, not at the beginning, indicates that there was no king at the time when he composed the Scroll, or if there was he did not recognise him. Hence the rather unexpected conclusion that the Scroll was composed during the first years of King Herodes.

The edition of the Scroll (the *Beilage* containing the text can be obtained separately from the publisher) reproduces on the whole correctly what can be read in the manuscript. The manner in which Professor Elliger emends the text and fills the gaps in the manuscript is peculiar. He supplies, for example, גְּזֹוֹלִי ("Räuberei") in I, 8, which is hardly Hebrew, and עֲרִיצִים בְּבָרִית ("Gewalttäter am Bunde") in II, 6, which is quite impossible in Hebrew and makes no sense in no language. The translation maintains the same standard. For example, the perfectly intelligible passage in IV, 8-9: דְּרָסָוּם

בָּעַיְן הַיּוֹשְׁבִים בָּהּ "they destroy hem (the fortified towns) in the presence of their inhabitants" is rendered: "Dann reissen sie sie in Trümmer und in Gefangenschaft müssen die da wohnen," the first part of which gives a meaning to the Hebrew text that is impossible and the second emends the text unnecessarily by inserting **ונשׁבוּ**. (The insertion is omitted in the edition of the Scroll). The word

לוֹא, however, crying out for insertion in V, 5, is not supplied. The noun **אָבִית** in XI, 6, is still read as a verb, and **בֵּית** and **מִשְׁפָט** are consistently rendered "house" and "judgment" respectively, instead of "place" and "punishment." The range of meaning of the Hebrew vocabulary is purposefully enlarged. For example, **בְּמִישָׁר** in III, 1, is rendered "unbehindert"; **וַיַּתֵּר** in VII, 7, "sich ausdehnt"; and **גָּלַחוּ** in XI, 6, "ihn blosszustellen" or "abzusetzen." The expression **קָרִים** in III, 8, is explained as having been intended by the author of the Scroll to be a participle of the verb **כִּיר** ("Funken hervorbringen"), which does not exist in Hebrew, and **דָּוְתִּי** in X, 2 (a phonetic spelling of **דָּחָותָאִי** to be a participle of the verb **כְּתַתָּה** ("anzünden"), which has no such meaning in Hebrew. With an exegesis of this kind, Professor Elliger has succeeded in offering a translation of the Habakkuk Scroll, which is in every respect unintelligible and a true reflection of his understanding of the text.

The critical examination by the author of the views of other scholars on the Habakkuk Scroll is in perfect consonance with the rest of his work. He stolidly maintains, for example, with a superior disregard of the truth, that the *only* argument in favour of the Christian origin of the Scroll is the expression **'ebhyonim**, but he denies that it refers to Christians. According to him, it refers to the followers of the True Teacher (he bravely concedes that this may be the correct translation of *moreh*

ha-sedeq), or perhaps to a larger group from which these followers were recruited. It is not yet a name, but is on the way to becoming the name of a definite group. Professor Elliger does not seem to have realised that his own interpretation of **'ebhyonim** refers to none other than *ptochoi* (the Poor), that is, the members of the Jerusalem Church, and to the *Ebionites*, the Jewish Christian sect. The True Teacher, our author argues, is not Jesus, because he is not a Prophet, but the same person as the Priest in II, 8. Professor Elliger is not embarrassed by the statement in II, 2, that the True Teacher, unlike the Priest, had revelations **מִפְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים** "from God's mouth," but he is aware of the insoluble difficulty into which his identification of the True Teacher with the Priest has led him. According to his reading, the Scroll may be the autobiography of the True Teacher but then it is incongruous that the author should have referred to himself so disconcertingly and misleadingly under different appellations. Professor Elliger assures us that this difficulty can be easily solved, but he omits, alas, to tell us exactly how. He suggests alternatively that the Priest, the author of the Scroll, may have been a follower and disciple of the True Teacher, but if so, his argument that the True Teacher is not Jesus, because he is the same person as the Priest, simply vanishes into the air.

At the conclusion of his work, Professor Elliger expresses his hope that the investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls will move forward from the stage of grandiose guesswork in small articles to that of detailed work on each single Scroll in bulky volumes. He claims to have inaugurated this new stage with his "Studien." The reader of this volume may feel that in seeking to achieve this end the author has been unnecessarily detailed and repetitive, especially in relation to unimportant points.

Cambridge.

J. L. TEICHER.

N. BENTWICH (ed.) : *Hebrew University Garland: A Silver Jubilee Symposium*. Valentine, Mitchell (Constellation Books), London, 1952. Pp. 133. 17s. 6d.

In 1950 the Hebrew University of Jerusalem celebrated its Silver Jubilee, and in 1951 the English Friends of the University completed their first twenty-five years of activity. To mark the occasion they have published this volume. It contains thirteen contributions. Many of them are by teachers of the University, and aim at giving an account of the contribution of Israel to learning and science during a quarter of a century. These may be referred to first.

The story of archæological research is told by E. L. Sukenik, who has himself taken a leading part in the work he describes. There have been important excavations at Affuleh, Tell Jerisheh, Ophel, Samaria, and elsewhere; ancient synagogues have been explored; new ossuary inscriptions have been discovered; and among the many objects of interest acquired by the University are several of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Ch. Wirszubski shows how Greek, which was originally established as an ancillary subject to Jewish studies, has come to be studied for its own sake in the University. The two main difficulties which confront Israeli students of the classics are, first, the lack of tradition—the teaching of Greek and Latin through the medium of Hebrew presents peculiar problems—and secondly, the lack of background—"the legacy of Greece and Rome is neither recognised as a part of the national heritage, nor is it the conscious background of contemporary civilisation in Israel." There are, however, signs that classical studies are gaining ground in the University. After describing the conditions which have favoured or hampered the rise of oriental studies (other than Hebrew and the ancient east), S. D. Goitein gives a sketch of their development. Two enormous projects have been undertaken, namely, the creation of a Concordance of Ancient

Arabic Poetry, and the editing of the main work of the Muslim historian al-Balâdhuri. The study of Muslim archæology and history has made significant strides, and the creation of a Corpus of the Judeo-Arabic Genizah material dealing with historical matters is planned. Research on Jewish and other oriental communities continues. In this connection the mass immigration of oriental Jews has made available valuable material for study. Chief among the urgent requirements for further development of oriental studies in Israel are funds for research, an oriental reading room, new departments—in particular a department for the study of the ancient east—and properly equipped headquarters.

L. Roth asks—is the Jewish mind being fostered, or is it likely to be fostered, in the Hebrew University? He sees certain dangers—for example, the tradition of Zionist ideology, and again, the contraction of Jerusalem into "a largish village." The only remedy for Jerusalem is the "two-way passage." Other languages besides Hebrew must be learnt; new ideas from abroad must be welcomed; more books must be made available; and greater opportunities for travel must be provided. The University must become "a world Jewish University." One of the inconveniences which faces the teacher of general history in Jerusalem is, writes R. Koebner, "the short supply of historical inspiration derived from the town and the country"—"the past which you explain to Hebrew-speaking students in lectures on general history has very little contact with that of their own people." Owing to the lack of staff, the teacher of history in Israel is unable to specialise. He has moreover to combat the feeling that Israel's past and present are "far more worth knowing than the past and present of all other peoples taken together." There is indeed a tendency to distrust, even despise, the academic historian. The supply of books is inadequate; and, if research is to be carried on successfully, more

scholarships and greater facilities for travel must be forthcoming. A. Mendilow points to special difficulties which people who use the Hebrew language experience in learning an Indo-European language. The emotional resistance to learning the language of a foreign government has, too, until recently, had to be overcome. The standard of English in the primary schools is still low—there is a serious lack of trained teachers—but in the secondary schools it is high. In the University today there are more than seven hundred students taking English at various levels. Many of them are attracted by the cultural aspect of English—"What the classics meant to the educated Englishman of the 18th century, English is coming to mean for the young educated Israeli."

S. Sambursky, writing on the development of scientific study in Israel, describes the work of the National Research Council of Israel, which was set up in 1949. Its activities include research in agriculture, industrial chemistry, building, food and nutrition, and biological studies. The results of this research are mostly published in international journals. The Council fosters contacts with scientists and institutions abroad. Indeed, such contacts, together with the need for more scientific manpower, and additional working facilities for specialists, are regarded as decisive for the future of science in Israel.

S. Brodetsky, who was President of the University from 1949-51, describes the development of the University, which has grown from three small research laboratories into an institution which has five Faculties (Humanities, Science, Medicine, Law, and Agriculture), libraries containing nearly a million books, almost two thousand five hundred students, a teaching staff of about three hundred and thirty, and a budget of one and a half million Israeli pounds. The University needs for its existence the support of both Israel and the Diaspora. Hope of a return to

Mount Scopus has not been abandoned, but improvements in the conditions of the University's work in the city of Jerusalem cannot be delayed in the meantime. The erection of laboratories is planned, and the needs of the humanities too are receiving attention. As for the future development of the University, the author thinks that an academic head of the University is desirable; that Israel's economic conditions will make it difficult to secure any considerable number of first class scholars from abroad; that the methods of promotion need to be revised; and that the distribution of students in the different Faculties needs to be regulated. The final aim is a University of Israel, with the Hebrew University and other institutions as sections of it.

The editor's contribution is an account of the work of the English Friends of the University from 1926-51. The Friends have collected books for the University libraries and money for scholarships, for the establishment of teaching posts, and for the promotion of research. The annual contribution made by them to Jerusalem has risen from thirteen thousand pounds in 1942 to nearly eighty thousand pounds in 1950. They gave much assistance in placing refugee scholars from Germany in the Hebrew University. Today they are the principal instrument of intellectual co-operation between Jerusalem and England, and they may be regarded as an important unifying factor in Anglo-Jewish relations. In recent years branches of the Friends have been formed in the principal provincial and university centres.

The four remaining contributions are of a different character. Sir Leon Simon describes how the Hebrew language is continually being remade in Israel to meet the requirements of modern life. Much valuable work has been accomplished by the *Va'ad HaLashon*, whose duty it is to watch over the development of the living language. A noteworthy feature in the development of the language

has been the gradual expulsion of words borrowed from foreign languages in favour of words created out of the resources of the Hebrew language itself. The language remains tolerant, however, of many foreign words. The trilateral nature of Hebrew verbs acts as a deterrent to the acceptance of words from European languages, as does also the Hebrew use of suffixes for the possessive pronouns. The fact that prefixes and suffixes can be freely added to Hebrew roots gives the language a great capacity for "spontaneous generation."

Lord Samuel's contribution, "The Limitations of Political Science," is the lecture which he delivered in Jerusalem when, on the occasion of his eightieth birthday, the University gave his name to its Chair of Political Science. He issues a strong warning against attempting too clearcut distinctions, as, for example, between monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, and again between individualism, socialism, and communism. He emphasises the importance of the family and the voluntary organisations. He shows how political science overlaps with psychology, ethics, philosophy, and religion. He suggests that there is perhaps a need for a fresh start, for the basing of politics "fairly and squarely upon ethics," ethics founded upon "the experience of ordinary people, of all races, in all countries, through all the ages. Out of that experience has evolved the Moral Law."

A lecture delivered by L. Baeck at the Hebrew University in 1951 is of all the contributions the most technical. After pointing out that the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans all speak of "law," he goes on to consider the question where the psychological root of a general idea of law is to be found.

A study entitled "Jewish Slavery and Emancipation," composed after a visit to Israel in 1951, is contributed by I. Berlin. The question of total assimilation, he believes, is irrelevant to the Jewish

problem. The fate of the Jews in Europe and America is described in the form of a parable—they are compared to travellers who accidentally find themselves among a tribe whose customs are unfamiliar to them; and the categories of "assimilated" Jews—"enjoying varying degrees of discomfort about the abnormality of their status"—are considered under the figure of a hunchback. The belief that Jews are better interpreters than creation needs radical qualification—it is not true, for example, in the case of mathematics and the natural sciences. The emergence of the State of Israel has transformed the situation of the Jews beyond recognition. For a Jew of the Diaspora the problem of "whether to go or stay, to assimilate or to remain in a betwixt-and-between condition" is now a purely individual problem—he is free to solve the problem as he chooses. Not only a national, but a world, problem has been solved in our own time.

From this necessarily brief indication of some of the contents of this volume, the reader will, it is hoped, have gained some idea of its interest and significance. One lays it aside with a feeling of sheer admiration for what has been accomplished in the building up of a university in so short a time and in the face of many and great difficulties. The University may take a justifiable pride in what has been achieved. But there is in this volume no trace of complacency. It is clearly recognised that immense problems lie ahead. There they will be faced with energy, courage, and faith will be a conviction which everyone who reads this volume will share. The Friends of the University have done well to issue this record of a remarkable period of endeavour. And the editor and his collaborators are to be congratulated on a volume worthy of the occasion. It is to be hoped that it will be widely read.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

Cambridge.